DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 952 EA 017 361

AUTHOR	Wise, Arthur E.; And Others
TITLE	Case Studies for Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	RAND-N-2133-NIE
PUB DATE	Jun 84
CONTRACT	400-82-0007
NOTE	181p.; Some figures may not reproduce due to small print. For a related document, see ED 246 559.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publication Sales, The Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406 (Stock No. RAND/N-2133-NIE; $15.00 prepaid or purchase order; quantity discounts).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Evaluation Utilization; Governance; *Organizational Climate; Participative Decision Making; Personnel Policy; Religious Cultural Groups; Staff Development; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Promotion; Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS	Greenwich Public Schools CT; Lake Washington School District WA; Mormons; Salt Lake City School District UT; Toledo Public Schools OH

ABSTRACT

This document presents the four case studies that constituted the major sources for "Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices" by the same authors. The study was undertaken to find teacher evaluation processes that produce information useful to school districts in helping teachers improve or in making personnel decisions. The four school districts selected for case studies represent diverse teacher evaluation processes and organizational environments: Salt Lake City, Utah; Lake Washington, Washington; Greenwich, Connecticut; and Toledo, Ohio. Indepth findings from each case study are discussed, including reasons for selection of that particular district and such topics as policy context, organizational setting, and the teacher evaluation system on paper and in practice. In the first study (Salt Lake City), pertinent information is also provided about the cultural context (the Mormons) and its relationship to the system of shared governance in the district. Despite differences in form, the four districts follow certain common practices in teacher evaluation: (1) providing top-level leadership and institutional resources for the evaluation process; (2) ensuring that evaluators have the necessary expertise; (3) faciltating collaboration between administrators and teachers; and (4) making evaluation and support systems compatible with each other and with the district's overall goals. (TE)

ED251952

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Tom Cockrell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 017 361

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-82-0007 from the National Institute of Education.

The Rand Publications Series: The Report is the principal publication documenting and transmitting Rand's major research findings and final research results. The Rand Note reports other outputs of sponsored research for general distribution. Publications of The Rand Corporation do not necessarily reflect the opinions or policies of the sponsors of Rand research.

Published by The Rand Corporation

PREFACE

This Note presents the four case studies that constituted the major sources of *Teacher Evaluation: A Study of Effective Practices*, R-3139-NIE, June 1984, by Arthur E. Wise, Linda Darling-Hammond, Milbrey W. McLaughlin, and Harriet T. Bernstein. This study of teacher evaluation practices was financed by the National Institute of Education, which correctly predicted the growing interest in improving teacher evaluation practices. The case studies, as well as the report, should be of interest to those initiating or revising teacher evaluation procedures.

School systems evaluate teachers in order to make decisions about teacher status and to help teachers improve their performance. Most existing literature on teacher evaluation concerns evaluation instruments and ways to improve the technical reliability and validity of these instruments, that is, how consistently and how accurately they measure teaching performance.[1]

The present study looks at the actual operation of teacher evaluation procedures in school systems. It examines not only the instruments and procedures, but also the implementation processes and organizational contexts in which they operate. This approach helps to reveal whether and how teacher evaluation results are used by the organization. It also indicates the broader organizational conditions needed to initiate and sustain effective teacher evaluation practices.

A panel composed of representatives of education and education-related organizations advised the study. The panel included:

Dr. Gordon Cawelti, Executive Director, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Dr. Susan S. Ellis, Teacher Leader for Staff Development, Greenwich (Connecticut) Public Schools (representing the National Staff Development Council)

---

[1]See Linda Darling-Hammond, Arthur E. Wise, and Sara R. Pease, "Teacher Evaluation in the Organizational Context: A Review of the Literature," *Review of Educational Research*, Fall 1983.

Ms. Anita Epstein, Governmental Affairs Director, National Association of State Boards of Education

Dr. Jeremiah Floyd, Associate Executive Director, Office of Communications and Membership Relations, National School Boards Association

Dr. David G. Imig, Executive Director, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Dr. James Keefe, Director of Research, National Association of Secondary School Principals

Ms. Lucille Maurer, Member, Maryland House of Delegates (representing the National Conference of State Legislatures)

Dr. Bernard McKenna, Program Development Specialist, National Education Association

Ms. Margaret Montgomery, Professional Development Specialist, National Association of Elementary School Principals

Dr. Reuben Pierce, Acting Assistant Superintendent for Quality Assurance, District of Columbia Public Schools

Dr. William Pierce, Executive Director, Council of Chief State School Officers

Ms. Marilyn Rauth, Director, Educational Issues Department, American Federation of Teachers

Dr. Robert W. Peebles, Superintendent of Schools, Alexandria (Virginia) City Public Schools (representing the American Association of School Administrators).

The involvement of the panel was meant to encourage a study and report that would be relevant to groups with a stake in teacher evaluation. The panel advised on the research plan, helped to identify school districts with highly developed teacher evaluation procedures, and commented on the drafts of the case studies and report. The participation of these panel members, however, does not necessarily imply their endorsement of the conclusions of either.

The panel advised that the report be kept short so that it would be widely read. Following this advice, the authors presented only their findings, analyses, conclusions, and recommendations in R-3139-NIE. The four case studies presented here thus constitute an appendix to that report.

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

We undertook this study to find teacher evaluation processes that produce information that school districts can use for helping teachers to improve and/or for making personnel decisions. The study began with a review of the literature and a preliminary survey of 32 school districts identified as having highly developed teacher evaluation systems. Although teacher evaluation practices in these districts seemed similar in broad outline, they diverged substantially as local implementation choices were made.

To select the case study districts from among the 32, we considered demographic criteria, organizational criteria (e.g., degree of centralization), the district's primary purpose for teacher evaluation, teacher evaluation processes, and the degree of implementation of the system. We finally selected four school districts representing diverse teacher evaluation processes and organizational environments: Salt Lake City, Utah; Lake Washington, Washington; Greenwich, Connecticut; and Toledo, Ohio.

Before visiting each school district, we reviewed the documentation pertaining to school district personnel and teacher evaluation policies. We then spent a week in each district interviewing the superintendent, director of personnel, most senior administrators in the central office, and other central office staff concerned with teacher evaluation. We also interviewed officers and executives of the local teachers' organizations, school board members, parents, and community representatives.

In each school district, we visited six schools of varying grade levels, size, and neighborhood type. At each school, we interviewed the principal, other specialized personnel, and at least six teachers, including the teachers' organization building representative.

SALT LAKE CITY

The hard-nosed yet relatively informal teacher evaluation process in Salt Lake City occurs in a state lacking a teacher tenure law and state-mandated teacher evaluation. The 25,000-student population of Salt Lake is relatively homogeneous for an urban district, and the dominant Mormon culture emphasizes education, conformity, and cooperative endeavor.

The concept of *shared governance* undergirding the teacher evaluation process conforms to Mormon community values. Management by decentralized consensus among parents, teachers, and administrators allows widespread input into nearly all aspects of school operations, including the assessment of teachers. Teachers are evaluated under a system based on communal decisionmaking with appeal to a higher authority.

Of the four case study districts, the Salt Lake teacher evaluation system centers most explicitly on making personnel decisions in the name of accountability. The remediation process to which principals may assign teachers judged inadequate has resulted in the removal of 37 teachers over the past nine years and the reinstatement of nearly that number of successfully remediated teachers to presumably more productive classroom teaching. Although principals initiate the remediation process, a four-member remediation team, composed of two administrators and two teachers, conducts the two- to five-month assistance and monitoring process. At the end of the remediation period, the principal recommends either termination or reinstatement.

The Salt Lake teacher evaluation system relies on an annual goal-setting exercise in which the principal and teacher confer on which system, school, or personal goals the teacher will pursue for the coming year. The system specifies neither the number of observations nor their duration. Observations may focus on either the adopted goals or a list of teaching criteria included in the collective bargaining agreement between the school district and the Salt Lake Teachers Association.

The evaluation system does not begin to operate in a highly formalized manner unless a teacher is performing poorly. Prior to formal remediation, a principal may initiate informal remediation, at

which point observed deficiencies and a specified plan of action are put in writing, and the teacher is given additional supervision and assistance. If informal remediation succeeds, no record of the process enters the teacher's personnel file. If it fails, the teacher receives formal remediation.

LAKE WASHINGTON

Lake Washington, a well-to-do suburban district of 18,000 students, is growing in enrollment. At the hub of the Washington aerospace industry, the district's professional clientele understand an engineering approach to problem solving, and they support the superintendent's *integrated systems* model for educational reform.

Despite statewide fiscal retrenchment, per pupil expenditures in Lake Washington remain relatively high, in part because the district has received public support in passing bond levies for the schools. A large portion of the district's budget is used to support a variety of staff development activities centered on Madeline Hunter's *instructional theory into practice* (ITIP) approach. Skilled teachers designated as ITIP trainers maintain a uniform instructional approach in the district's staff development and teacher evaluation efforts.

In contrast to that of Salt Lake City, Lake Washington's teacher evaluation process is highly structured from beginning to end. Developed in 1976 in response to a state mandate, the evaluation system employs the state criteria in a checklist that the principal uses in observations of each teacher twice each year. Pre- and postobservation conferences accompany each classroom visit.

If a teacher receives less than a satisfactory rating on any criterion, the principal outlines a detailed personal development plan, which may include assistance from an experienced teacher, in-service classes, and specific reading assignments. If the teacher fails to improve, the principal places him or her on probation. During the probationary period, the principal meets weekly with the teacher to monitor progress toward specified performance levels. At the end of the semester, the principal, together with central office supervisors, decides the continued tenure of the teacher in the school district.

Although the professed goal of teacher evaluation in Lake Washington is instructional improvement rather than accountability, the system is designed to be used for making personnel decisions. District administrators claim that the evaluation system has resulted in the counseling out of about 40 teachers over a four-year period, a figure that represents about 5 percent of the total teaching force in the district.

A concomitant emphasis on staff development and rationalized management are said to have brought a 20-percentile gain in pupil achievement scores over the same period. The cornerstone of Lake Washington's approach is the principal's role in managing the attainment of centrally determined goals and performance standards.

GREENWICH

Greenwich, a wealthy suburban district of 7500 students, is populated largely by managers and professionals. The district's performance goal approach to school management and teacher evaluation reflects a managerial orientation based on incentives.

Operationally, the Greenwich approach means that, while centrally determined goals are used for school management decisions, the goals by which teachers are evaluated are not necessarily predetermined system goals. Each year, in consultation with the principal or teacher leader (a teacher with part-time administrative status), teachers set their own individual goals, plans for achieving the goals, and means for measuring whether the goals have been accomplished. Although teachers may choose system goals, the evaluation process is intended to foster individual improvement, and its design allows for individualized definitions of growth and development.

The Greenwich evaluation process includes at least one observation and three conferences between the evaluator and teacher each year. Teachers complete a self-evaluation report, and evaluators complete an open-ended evaluation report, which may be based on both the specific annual goals and on general teaching guidelines included in the collective bargaining agreement. Evaluation may result in a teacher's being placed on marginal status, but this rarely occurs in

Greenwich--perhaps because of the evaluation process, or perhaps because the district's teaching force is highly experienced and highly educated.

The test of the Greenwich approach, given its individualized nature, is whether teachers say that it helps them improve their teaching. In recent surveys conducted by the district, about half of them said that it did. Because it operates carefully, the process forces regularized, teacher-specific interaction between principals and teachers and provides a focus and recognition for teachers' efforts. Based on a motivational theory of management, the approach tries to balance individual stages of development and system goals.

TOLEDO

Toledo is a working-class, union town with a strong teachers' union. In the 1970s, a long-standing conflict between the school district management and the teachers' union, fiscal distress, and a lengthy teachers' strike led to a series of district school shutdowns. Only the concerted efforts of administrators and teachers to repair the rift by agreeing to share decisionmaking powers reversed the decline in student enrollment and public support for the schools.

As elsewhere, teacher evaluation in Toledo responds to public demands for evidence of quality control in the school system. The difference is that in Toledo the teachers' organization took the lead in defining and enforcing a standard of professional conduct and competence.

Toledo's teacher evaluation system differs from all of the others in two important respects. First, skilled consulting teachers evaluate new teachers and experienced teachers having difficulty. Second, the evaluation process does not seek to evaluate each teacher each year. Evaluation resources are targeted on first-year teachers (interns) and teachers assigned to an intervention program. The consulting teachers observe and confer with these teachers at least once every two weeks for the period of the internship or intervention.

Principals evaluate other teachers annually until the teachers receive tenure, and once every four years thereafter. If a teacher qualifies for a continuing contract, formal evaluation ceases unless the teacher is placed in the intervention program. The principal and the

union's building committee jointly decide the assignment of a teacher to intervention; assistant superintendent of personnel and the president of the Toledo Federation of Teachers must concur in the decision.

Although the express purpose of evaluation in Toledo is to promote individual professional growth, evaluation serves as the basis for making personnel decisions regarding contract status and continued tenure in the district. In the two years since the intern and intervention programs began, 4 of 66 interns were not rehired and 4 of 10 intervention teachers were removed from classroom teaching. The intensive supervision and assistance provided to intern and intervention teachers serves the individual improvement purpose for these teachers, but not to the exclusion of accountability goals.

THE FOUR EVALUATION SYSTEMS IN REVIEW: DIFFERENT BUT SIMILAR

The case study districts approach the task of teacher evaluation in different ways. They emphasize different purposes for evaluation; they use different methods for assessing teachers; and they assign different roles to teachers, principals, and central office administrators in the evaluation process.

These evaluation systems nevertheless share implementation characteristics. The commonalities in implementation, in fact, set these four systems apart from less successful ones. Moreover, they suggest that implementation factors contributing to the success of these systems may also contribute to the success of other formal processes.

The four teacher evaluation systems vary with respect to the primary evaluators and the teachers who are evaluated. They also differ with respect to the major purposes of evaluation, the instruments used, the processes by which evaluation judgments are made, and the linkage between teacher evaluation and other school district activities, such as staff development and instructional management. Finally, districts represent dramatically different contexts for teacher evaluation in terms of student population, financial circumstances, and political environment.

Despite these differences in form, the four districts follow certain common practices in implementing their teacher evaluation systems. Specifically,

1. They provide top-level leadership and institutional resources for the evaluation process.
2. They ensure that evaluators have the necessary expertise to perform their task.
3. They enable administrators and teachers to collaborate to develop a common understanding of evaluation goals and processes.
4. They use an evaluation process and support systems that are compatible with each other and with the district's overall goals and organizational context.

By paying attention to these four implementation factors, Salt Lake City, Lake Washington, Greenwich, and Toledo have elevated evaluation from what is often a formal, meaningless exercise to a process that produces useful results. Although these factors seem to be straightforward and self-evident requisites for effective evaluation, they are not easily accomplished and are usually overlooked in the pressure to develop and adopt the perfect checklist or set of criteria for teacher evaluation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the many educators and citizens who agreed to be interviewed for this study. In particular, we thank the personnel officers in the 32 school districts who provided us with an initial understanding of district practices. Most especially, we are grateful to the several hundred teachers, administrators, school board members, and others in the case study districts--Greenwich, Lake Washington, Salt Lake City, and Toledo--who generously gave us their time and insights.

Joseph Vaughan was the NIE Project Officer responsible for the Teacher Evaluation Study. His conception of the project and his advice were major influences. The members of the panel advising the study helped us immensely.

The Note has profited also from the constructive criticism of our colleagues Richard Shavelson and Steven Schlossman of Rand and Gary Sykes of Stanford University. We owe a continuing debt to Shirley Lithgow and Nancy Rizor, whose typing and other assistance greatly facilitated the accomplishment of this project. Thanks are also due to Barbara Eubank and Rosalie Fonoroff. Erma Packman has made the reader's task a little easier.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS xiii

Section

I. THE SALT LAKE CITY (UTAH) PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM 1

Reasons for the Selection of Salt Lake City 1
The Policy Context 2
The Cultural Context 5
Educational and Organizational Concepts 6
Conception of Teaching 8
The Teacher Evaluation System on Paper 10
Implementation in the Organizational Context: How the System Really Works 21
The Future of Shared Governance and Teacher Evaluation 30
The Fit between Mormon Culture and Shared Governance 31
Would It Work in Another Setting? 32
Evaluating the Teacher Evaluation System 33

II. THE LAKE WASHINGTON (WASHINGTON) SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 414 TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM 38

Reasons for the Selection of Lake Washington 38
The Policy Context 39
The Organizational Setting 42
The Teacher Evaluation System 47
Strengths and Weaknesses of the Lake Washington System 57
Lessons from Lake Washington 63

III. THE GREENWICH (CONNECTICUT) PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM 88

Reasons for the Selection of Greenwich 88
The Policy Context 89
The Teacher Evaluation System on Paper 92
How Evaluation Works in the Organizational Context 104
Evaluating the Teacher Evaluation System 114

IV. THE TOLEDO (OHIO) PUBLIC SCHOOL INTERN AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS 119

Reasons for the Selection of Toledo 119
The Policy Context 121
The Regular Teacher Evaluation Process 134
Systems Supporting the Evaluation Process 156
Evaluating the Teacher Evaluation Process 158

I. THE SALT LAKE CITY (UTAH) PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

Harriet T. Bernstein

REASONS FOR THE SELECTION OF SALT LAKE CITY

The Salt Lake City Public School System was chosen as one of four case study sites primarily because of the attention it had already received. Donald Thomas, the city's innovative superintendent, had written widely about its teacher evaluation system. In addition, Salt Lake's *shared governance* approach, through which the school board and superintendent share control over many decisions with the teachers association and parents, has attracted national attention, both admiring and critical. The teacher evaluation system, which is deeply embedded in the shared governance system, owes much of its distinctiveness to this unique political structure.

Salt Lake's teacher evaluation system has operated for nine years. During that time, 37 long-term teachers have been terminated for unsatisfactory teaching. In all cases, the Salt Lake Teachers Association (SLTA, an NEA affiliate) participated with management in an effort to help the teacher improve his or her performance.

Dismissals occurred only when the two SLTA representatives on the Remediation Team agreed with the two administration representatives that remediation efforts had failed. Although the SLTA has been willing to perform the traditional role of an employee organization by providing legal services to those who contest termination decisions, SLTA's coequal participation in the process has virtually guaranteed that such decisions will survive judicial scrutiny.

In addition, some technical features of Salt Lake's teacher evaluation system gave needed balance to the overall Rand study. In two other study sites, principals are responsible for evaluating teachers. In Salt Lake City, however, the principal has the sole responsibility

only for initiating and ending the Remediation Team's activities. Thereafter, he is only one of a four-member team that observes and helps the teacher.

Salt Lake also differs from the other case study sites in that its teacher evaluation system resulted not from state legislation or mandate, but from the efforts of a concerned citizenry and a philosophical superintendent. Furthermore, Salt Lake City frankly cites *accountability* as the purpose of its teacher evaluation system, whereas the other chosen sites allude to such purposes as *staff development* and *school improvement*. This difference in purpose, then, suggested a question for the study: Does a system blatantly aimed at removing incompetent teachers cause more anxiety among teachers than one aimed at softer, more formative goals?

Finally, Salt Lake public schools posed a challenge for the study team. The theory of shared governance implies the following substantial rearrangement of powers: Schools and their respective communities share equally in specified areas of decisionmaking; principals and their faculties together determine specified matters; and central office staff and SLTA representatives codirect many, though not all, of the system's functions. Primarily consensus, rather than majority vote, resolves issues, although the board of education continues to operate by vote and majority rule. Because the governance system appeared to be so fundamentally different from the norm, we wanted to see how it shaped the actual workings of the teacher evaluation process.

THE POLICY CONTEXT

Salt Lake public schools enroll 25,000 students and employ 1,100 teachers in four high schools, five intermediate schools, and 27 elementary schools. The district spends $2265 per pupil annually. Of the students, 78 percent are white, 22 percent are minorities, and 28 percent are eligible for Chapter I services. Although the school district is an urban one, 55 percent of graduating seniors plan to attend college and 20 percent participate in the Advanced Placement Testing Program.

Student enrollment is now growing at the rate of 3 percent annually; a sharp drop in enrollment over the past decade, however, forced the closure of many schools. The public resented not only the loss of local schools, but also the allegedly arbitrary and secretive process that the board used to make closure decisions. Many believed that the decline in enrollment required a corresponding reduction in central office staff. Public dissatisfaction with the schools was further compounded by evidence of fiscal mismanagement: The district had a deficit.

As these events and attitudes unfolded, a state-mandated reorganization of local school boards required Salt Lake to reduce the size of its board from 12 to 7 members. A new and smaller board was elected in 1973 on the candidates' promises to address public complaints about secrecy, overhead, and fiscal controls. The board bought up the contract of the former superintendent and searched for a new one outside the district.

The board chose as the new superintendent Dr. M. Donald Thomas, a non-Utahan and non-Morman, who was then superintendent of the Newark (California) Unified School District. In that assignment, Thomas had become disenchanted with the impact of "hard-nosed bargaining" on public education and had instituted a shared governance concept. The notion appealed to the Salt Lake City Board of Education as it sought to restore public confidence and open the decisionmaking process.

Thomas took office in Salt Lake on July 5, 1973. During his decade on the job, he has reshaped governance, organization, management/union relationships, evaluation, and the complaint-resolution process according to his lights. He has created a series of novel and interrelated governance contrivances that have the effect of diffusing power and responsibility, rewarding--indeed nearly forcing--face-to-face communication, and surfacing and attempting to resolve all manner of dissatisfactions.

Instead of attempting to control the system through bureaucratic and rationalistic procedures flowing out of the central office, Thomas has given away to both teachers and parents powers that most school officials would believe to be the *sine qua non* of their calling.

Paradoxically, Thomas appears to be completely in charge. Thanks to his style and array of governance mechanisms (which will be described in the next section of this study), Salt Lake City school staff and parents are talking, persuading, canvassing, negotiating, complaining, and exercising real, if circumscribed, power over local school programs and policies.

In response to the 1973 board's desire to prune central office staff, Thomas not only eliminated enough positions to empty one of two headquarters buildings, but also flattened the organizational chart. In Thomas's words, "I got rid of high-sounding titles." Instead of a deputy superintendent, he has a staff coordinator. Instead of assistant superintendents, he has administrators for Educational Resources, Educational Accountability, and Personnel Services.

Principals report directly to Thomas, whose door is literally always open. He has virtually eliminated the contingent of curriculum supervisors found in most districts because he believes that working teachers, not administrators or textbook publishers, should be in charge of curriculum. That unusual stance, and its ramifications for accountability and teacher evaluation, are discussed in subsequent sections of this case study.

The existence of shared governance alone would suffice to establish the novelty of the Salt Lake public school policy context. The juxtaposition of that form of governance with a unique American subculture makes Salt Lake City remarkably different from most other communities.

The influence of the Mormon Church (Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints) pervades the city. Though a numerical minority in Salt Lake (now 48 percent), the Mormons are so highly organized that competing influences appear weak. One aspect of this study, then, was to ascertain the compatibility (or lack of it) of public school shared governance with Mormon concepts of governance, responsibility, participation, and decisionmaking.

Students of public education, accustomed to adversarial power blocs and conventional role definitions in educational hierarchies, may see the Salt Lake City plan as a case of management capitulating its rightful powers to the union. Others may marvel that a politically

conservative locality would support a seemingly liberal governance innovation. Still others may wonder how a hierarchical religious subculture would interact with an apparently communitarian public school system. This study attempts to answer these questions, particularly with respect to teacher evaluation, so that readers can judge for themselves whether the shared governance approach to teacher evaluation can be applied to other American environments.

THE CULTURAL CONTEXT

Salt Lake, like other Mormon communities in the mid-1800s, was organized into wards. Church-appointed, unpaid bishops were given the responsibility for establishing and supervising schools. School taxes were levied by ward school committees, which also saw to the hiring of teachers.

In 1851, the territorial legislature voted the establishment of a public school system supported by taxation, and the bishop-established schools were subsumed into the public educational system. The churchly origins of the schools, however, along with the intensity of the Mormon culture, have placed the stamp of Mormon social and educational values on today's public schools, despite their structural separation from the church.[1]

Mormons appear to accept traditional values, order, and control without ambivalence. Student or teacher lapses from virtue appear to be felt more keenly than elsewhere. According to Arrington and Bitton, "education has long been a kind of obsession among Mormons." They cite some impressive statistics:

> While precise church figures are unavailable, Utah (72 percent of its population being Mormon) of all the states in the last thirty years has usually had the highest proportion of its population in school, the highest proportion of high school graduates, and has usually spent on education the greatest amount of money in relation to total personal income.[2]

---

[1]Leonard J. Arrington and Davis Bitton, *The Mormon Experience: A History of the Latter-Day Saints* (New York: Vintage Books, 1980), p. 304.

[2]Ibid.

Mormons value education second only to family. Mormons tend to have large families, and mothers are urged to stay home and raise the children. Monday nights are designated as a time for family discussion in the home, led by father. Local churches provide wholesome afternoon and evening activities for children, youth, and families. Although the divorce rate and percentage of working mothers has been rising among Mormons in recent years, their incidence is still well below the national average.

Thus, Salt Lake City public schools serve a population that would make teachers elsewhere envious. A critical mass of children come from homes that nurture discipline, cleanliness, and achievement, and the public schools are expected to sustain those values.

EDUCATIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONCEPTS

Donald Thomas set forth four principles of shared governance: delegation; consensus and parity; review and appeal; and trust, openness, and equity.

The principle of delegation was established in 1973, when the board of education agreed to delegate all but the most important decisions to the superintendent with the proviso that he administer the schools "in cooperation with the employees and the patrons of the school district." In Article 14 of the SLTA contract, entitled *A Written Agreement Based on Shared Governance*, the board of education officially endorses the concepts both of delegation and shared governance. Specific provisions defining the requirements to share are scattered throughout.

Delegation is defined not only as the board's delegation of authority to the superintendent, but also as the superintendent's delegation of authority to teachers and parents. According to the agreement, the president and executive director of the SLTA are entitled to attend all of the superintendent's staff meetings; the SLTA and superintendent work together to develop a preliminary budget proposal for presentation to the board; and a complement of teachers and parents serves on the various committees and councils.

Under Thomas's second principle--consensus and parity--local school and central-office governing councils and committees are urged to keep talking until all parties reach agreement. If consensus cannot be achieved, parity voting is tried. Each party casts one vote: In a school community council, the faculty gets one vote and the patrons as a whole get one vote; in a school improvement council, the principal gets one vote and the faculty gets one vote; and on the remediation teams, the administration's two representatives get one vote each and the two SLTA representatives get one vote each.

When a committee resorts to parity voting because it cannot achieve consensus, it explicitly acknowledges that an impasse exists and it forfeits the decision to the superintendent or, ultimately, to the board. Thus, substantial incentives exist for reaching a consensus.

Consensus and parity attempt to avoid what Thomas calls "power negotiations," in which councils, committees, and groups "utilize numbers to win a position: stack the committee, circulate petitions, send hundreds to a meeting, etc." It provides an alternative to "the traditional, autocratic styles of educational leadership" under which "principals and superintendents base many of their decisions and actions on the sovereignty of their positions; they enforce their power in handing down decisions which may or may not be beneficial to students."

According to Thomas, the "autocratic" approach establishes decisions on a win/lose basis, "where in actuality nobody wins and everybody loses."[3] In Salt Lake City, the exercise of power "takes the form of knowledge, persuasion by ideas, options, and doing what others believe to be right," according to the shared governance manual.

The third principle--review and appeal--is codified in the agreement. The traditional grievance process for teachers claiming violations of the agreement provides one appeal track. A second appeal mechanism is available for resolving impasses in the many shared governance councils, committees, and teams. The superintendent hears all appeals from groups unable to reach consensus or achieve a unified parity vote.

---

[3]*Shared Governance: Active Cooperation for a More Effective Education*, Training Manual, Second Edition, Salt Lake City School District, January 1983.

For resolving all other matters, a process called *Review of Services* provides a lively and unique approach to dispute resolution. Essentially, anyone in Salt Lake--citizen, school employee, or superintendent--can compel an external review by a mutually acceptable neutral party of any matter he believes to be unfair, unjust, or not in the best interests of the students.

Thomas's fourth principle--trust, openness, and equity--is more hortatory than structural. It illustrates the role Thomas has carved out for himself, that of roving philosopher of democracy. His governance creation is designed to combat the "mistrust and suspicion which were creeping into the educational system, on the part of teachers and administrators as well as from the community and students." He asserts his faith in the "consent of the governed" and relies on this fourth principle to achieve that consent in the school system.

In sharing authority with the traditional power interests, Thomas allows the blind spots and self-interests of one group to check those of other groups. He relies on consensus decisionmaking to achieve the consent of all parties to any policy or action.

Although the scope of decisionmaking is carefully defined at each level, and although the legal authority of the federal and state governments, the board, and the superintendent are specifically excluded from its purview, shared governance clearly has led to a substantial transfer of power. Centralized, substantive decisionmaking is kept to a minimum. Instead, the system is unified by a shared *process* for decisionmaking. Each school may make different decisions but must follow a common process in arriving at them.

CONCEPTION OF TEACHING

The political foundation of shared governance was a trade-off between management and labor. The teachers were guaranteed job security (except for evaluation-based terminations) in exchange for their willingness to abandon adversarial unionism. Salt Lake teachers are thus protected from layoffs due to declining enrollment or budget reductions. The bargain reflects Salt Lake's attitude toward teaching work: All teachers are assumed to be competent professionals unless proved incompetent by a procedure comanaged by their peers.

Mitchell and Kerchner classified teaching work as labor, craft, profession, and/or art.[4] The job security arrangement is only one of many manifestations of Salt Lake City's view of its teachers as professionals.

The existence of only general curriculum guides (mainly at the elementary school level) and the near absence of prescriptiveness for teaching practices indicate clearly that Salt Lake City does not view its teachers as laborers responsible for implementing specified routines and procedures under the close supervision of administrators. Moreover, the absence of generalized rules for applying specific teaching techniques and the reliance, instead, on teachers' professional judgment in the appropriate use of their technical repertoire suggest that Mitchell and Kerchner's definition of craft does not apply here either.

Their definition of the teacher as an artist, free to express personality and to use intuition, creativity, and unconventional strategies, also does not quite fit the Salt Lake City case, although no written rules preclude such actions. Through interviews with teachers and administrators who had served on remediation teams, however, the authors noticed a systemic intolerance of teachers who departed too blatantly from conventional strategies even if they were admitted to be educationally effective. The surrounding culture puts a high premium on order, control, and neatness. If a teacher's approach achieved learning goals at the expense of those values, he or she probably would not be regarded as an artist, but as a marginal teacher.

Mitchell and Kerchner's definition of the teacher as a professional is probably more fully realized in Salt Lake City than in most school districts. First of all, because Utah has no tenure law, new and old teachers alike are technically regarded as competent professionals. Conversely, all are equally subject to termination for cause.

Second, control over curriculum has been delegated to teachers, as opposed to central office administrators. A cadre of 40 outstanding teachers (their method of selection will be discussed later),

---

[4]Douglas E. Mitchell and Charles T. Kerchner, "Collective Bargaining and Teacher Policy," paper presented at the NIE Teaching and Policy Studies Conference, 1981.

representing various grade levels, subject areas, and extracurricular specialties, are given small stipends and time off from their regular duties to evaluate curriculum, review textbooks and materials, and consult with other teachers on request.

Third, the shared governance system gives equal representation to teachers and administrators on the committees that deal with evaluation of local university courses and teachers' in-service work in regard to qualifications for salary lane changes; in-service policy and the allocation of funds for travel and conventions; elementary report card policy (shared with parents); filling of administrative vacancies; and class size, teacher load, and teacher reassignment actions.

Finally, the evaluation system in Salt Lake is based on a fully professional conception of teaching work. The criteria for judging teacher performance were developed by teachers, and teachers take the responsibility for assisting new and unsatisfactory teachers. While administrators activate these procedures, organize their implementation, and render a final verdict, teacher evaluation is fundamentally a matter of teachers helping and judging other teachers.

Lest the reader conclude that Salt Lake City is teacher heaven, he should note that the rights conferred on teachers as professionals also impose responsibilities. Many would rather avoid the pain of making tough decisions, particularly when resources are limited. Some secondary teachers expressed a desire for more central direction by the school system and more curricular guidance and uniformity.

More important, shared governance has taken away some traditional powers from teachers and given them coequally to parents. Teachers in Salt Lake can no longer make all decisions by professional fiat, but must now actively persuade parents that a particular course of action is educationally correct. That is a new and demanding role for teachers, and some find it uncomfortable.

THE TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM ON PAPER

Three mechanisms underlie the official teacher evaluation system in Salt Lake City schools: *accountability*, replacing the typical annual teacher evaluation seen in most districts; *informal remediation*, undertaken when a principal believes that a teacher is not functioning

at the expected level; and *formal remediation*, invoked when the principal believes his own efforts at informal remediation have not succeeded. Guidelines for the conduct of these mechanisms are printed in the *Written Agreement*, along with a list of "Teaching Expectancies" developed by the SLTA.

In addition to these three mechanisms, a number of other shared governance procedures feed into or obliquely influence the official teacher evaluation system. These mechanisms and procedures are described below in descending order of their relationship to teacher evaluation.

Accountability

Although accountability is said to be the Salt Lake City version of an annual teacher evaluation process, the absence of conventional trappings found elsewhere--observation instruments, checklists of competencies, time limitations on formal observations, etc.--compel the conclusion that it is a multipurpose procedure of which the evaluation of teacher performance is only a small part.

The *Written Agreement* requires each principal to hold a conference with each of his teachers early in the school year. An "Accountability Report Form" serves as the basis for discussion. The form is a simple listing of goals--system-wide, school-wide, and personal--and the purpose of the conference is to determine the ways in which an individual teacher can contribute to the realization of those goals.

System-wide goals are set annually by the board of education. The board established several goals for the 1982-1983 school year; these included to contribute to the "Power of Positive People" campaign to intensify public confidence; to initiate cost-saving strategies in expenditures, absenteeism, and the use of district resources; and to implement and refine vocational education objectives in secondary schools. The goals appear on each year's form. Standards by which to judge the accomplishment of the goals are entered on the form. Due dates for reports from each school to the central office are printed on the form.

Although particular goals may not apply to all teachers, their presence on the form seems to be a way to rivet the attention of the teachers on the board's goals. The force with which the principals discuss ways to accomplish the board goals with their teachers is no doubt influenced by a stern feature of the plan: Principals and central office administrators risk the loss of a 2 percent salary increment if system-wide goals are not met.

Schools are expected to decide communally on two building goals for the year, and those goals appear first on the form. The principal is required to report to the faculty each year on the accomplishment of school goals.

During the early years of the accountability program, teachers were required to set personal teaching goals and urged to select measurable ones. That feature was recently abandoned. Teachers now have the option of selecting a personal goal or not. Data on how many of them do so were unavailable.

The only way that accountability can be seen as a teacher evaluation system is that it forces principals to sit down with each teacher every year to talk about mutual concerns and encourages principals to visit classes to determine whether teachers are meeting personal goals and making appropriate contributions to school and board goals. Principals must fill out a brief form for each teacher. Perhaps a teacher needing remediation is more likely to be spotted by this method than by the usual evaluation system.

Informal Remediation

Principals are required, by contract, to use informal remediation as a first step before placing a teacher on formal remediation. The principal must inform the teacher orally and in writing of his reasons for initiating informal remediation. He must also develop recommendations for improving the teacher's performance, and may call for assistance from the central office to help the teacher achieve the recommended changes. The teacher may request the presence of an SLTA representative at conferences with the principal. No part of the informal remediation process appears in the teacher's personnel file.

Formal Remediation

Principals alone decide whether a teacher should be placed on formal remediation. Once a principal has filed a "Referral for Remediation" form with the central office, the superintendent designates a "learning specialist" from among five central office administrators. The learning specialist in charge of the particular case assembles a remediation team and coordinates its efforts.

The administration's representatives on the remediation team are the learning specialist and the building principal. The SLTA also appoints two members: one whose grade level or subject matter assignment matches that of the teacher on remediation and another who guards the due process rights of the teacher.

If the four-member team decides that a teacher needs more intensive help than they can provide, they are authorized to select another teacher from among retired teachers or teachers on leave. This fifth teacher will spend all day every day with the teacher on remediation, modeling good teaching practices, coaching the teacher, or helping with planning and materials. Although not an official member of the team, the fifth person can be hired for a week, or even a month, to help the teacher achieve the goals set forth in the remediation plan developed by the team.

After two months, the team decides whether the remediation has succeeded; if it has, the process is dropped. If not, the process is continued for another three months. At the end of five months, the principal determines whether the teacher should be recommended for termination.

In the early years of shared governance and formal remediation, the team members reached consensus on a termination decision. In recent years, however, the SLTA has requested that principals make the final decision, based on their own observations and the team's report. This change evidently makes the peer members of the team more comfortable with the process; it also signals a significant retreat from the power once accorded to teachers.

Regardless of who signs the papers recommending termination, peers selected by the SLTA have done the lion's share of evaluation and have rendered an opinion on whether the teacher has achieved a satisfactory level of performance on the district's teaching criteria. The following teacher evaluation criteria, known as *teacher expectancies*, were developed by teachers and jointly adopted by the administration and the SLTA:[5]

1. Determines standards of expected student performance

    a. Pre-assessment (diagnosis)
    b. Competencies expected at a given level
    c. Determine individual needs
    d. Expected goals for student achievement
    e. Evaluation of goals

2. Provides learning environment

    a. Availability of resources personnel
    b. Availability of variety of resource materials
    c. Physical organization and learning process
    d. Positive attitude toward student
    e. All students can learn
    f. Teacher shows enthusiasm and commitment for the subject taught
    g. Student behavior demonstrates acceptance of learning experience

3. Demonstrates appropriate student control

    a. Evidence that student knows what to do
    b. Evidence that student is working at task
    c. Evidence of positive responses from students because of adults' demonstration of fairness, acceptance, respect, flexibility, etc.
    d. Appropriate control in crisis situation
    e. Anticipate and avoid crisis situations

4. Demonstrates appropriate strategies for teaching

    a. Demonstrates techniques that are appropriate to different levels of learning
    b. Adjusts techniques to different learning styles
    c. Uses variety of techniques to teach specific skill or concept

---

[5] *A Written Agreement Based on Shared Governance between the Board of Education of Salt Lake City and the Salt Lake Teachers Association*, August 1982.

d. Gives directions that are clear, concise, and appropriate to the student learning level
e. Establishes two-way communication with students and utilizes feedback to determine teaching strategies
f. Demonstrates that a purpose has been determined for the instruction

Transfer and Assignment Process

Although not an official part of the teacher evaluation system, the Salt Lake Public Schools process for the transfer of teachers from one school to another, both voluntary and involuntary, appears to operate as a sub-rosa part of the teacher evaluation system. Since teachers may not be terminated for reasons of declining enrollment or budget cutbacks, the system has reserved for itself the right to declare staff "unassigned," based on student enrollment, revenue, and program needs.

Decisions about which teachers will be declared unassigned are made by the School Improvement Council in each school. Unassigned teachers must be paid full salary since they are deemed to be satisfactory by virtue of not having been placed on remediation. The system's incentive to find a placement for such teachers is therefore strong.

An Assignment/Load Committee searches for vacancies created by shifting enrollment and retirements and tries to fill such slots with unassigned teachers, as well as those voluntarily seeking a change. According to several accounts, the transfer list contains good teachers seeking new challenges, teachers unassigned for legitimate reasons, less-than-adequate teachers hoping to avoid remediation, and teachers declared unassigned ostensibly for program reasons but actually sometimes because they are seen as problems.

The Assignment/Load Committee is chaired by the administrator for personnel services and staffed with four teachers chosen by the SLTA and three administrators chosen by the Administrators' Association. This shared governance committee balances the needs of principals to "send a teacher a message" while not actually placing the teacher on remediation, against the need of the SLTA to secure a reasonable class load for all its members. Teachers repeatedly declared unassigned thus come to the attention of both the administrator and teacher representatives on the committee.

Review of Services

The review-of-services process is a wide-open grievance vehicle for anyone on any matter not covered by the "Written Agreement." A citizen or staff member with a complaint about a person, policy, or program must first visit the school staff member against whom the complaint is made and attempt a resolution of the matter informally. If the complainant thinks that the matter has not been resolved, he must then fill out a review-of-services request form. A central office administrator works with the complainant to select an acceptable neutral party, usually someone in the central office but sometimes a university professor, a businessman, or a retired educator.

If a review by the neutral party clears up a dispute between a teacher and parent, the records are destroyed and, theoretically, no harm has been done to the teacher. If a teacher is revealed to be performing poorly or unprofessionally, then the principal is also revealed as either too timid to activate the remediation process or ignorant of what goes on in his building.

The existence of the review-of-services program puts pressure on principals to remediate poor teachers lest the principals themselves be put on remediation by the superintendent. Donald Thomas told us that he had put some principals on remediation when they informally complained to him about teachers in their buildings but admitted to not having done anything about their complaints.

The review-of-services procedure appears to work in two somewhat contradictory ways. On the one hand, the process invites complaints from all quarters because it legitimizes complaints, even trivial ones. On the other hand, shy or fearful people might be discouraged from the attempt because they must first meet face-to-face with the staff member in question and obtain that person's signature on a form which attests, in essence, to an unsatisfactory meeting with the staff member. A review cannot be thwarted, however, by the "accused" refusing to sign. The form is processed as if it were signed. By forcing communication at the lowest possible level, expensive and time-consuming reviews of complaints without merit are often avoided.

Despite the confrontational feature of the process, 101 reviews of services were requested in 1980-1981, 33 of which involved teachers. Although fewer than one-fourth of these allegations were judged to be "mostly accurate" by impartial investigators, the process generally has the effect of warning principals that a teacher may be in trouble and sometimes bolsters their resolve to put a teacher on remediation. One-third of the teachers on remediation over the past nine years were placed there because a review of services illuminated a serious problem. This fact attests to the empowerment of Salt Lake parents in the matter of teacher effectiveness.

Association Contact Team: Peer Advisers to New Teachers

Fueled by the energy of a few teachers concerned about the lonely plight of first-year teachers, Salt Lake City public schools have developed a peer-support system for beginning teachers. The peer adviser program is not yet linked to the formal evaluation system and lacks the power to deny new teachers entrance into the profession. However, it supports and coaches novices, teaching them the things that teacher colleges failed to teach--how to organize a class for instruction, how to maintain attention and order, how to keep and use records, and how to order supplies and materials.

As a first step in constructing the program, principals and SLTA representatives in each building were asked to nominate the finest teachers in their schools. A management/SLTA committee screened and interviewed the nominees, searching for a mix of teachers from different grade levels, subject matter specialties, and special program areas, such as special and bilingual education. Teachers with "excellent interpersonal skills and discretion in dealing with peers, students, parents, and administrators" were sought.

Ten peer advisers were selected for the 1981-1982 school year for a one-year term. Both the association and the system contributed funds for $300 stipends and substitute coverage. Peer advisers may be released from their own teaching assignments for eight teaching days to work with new teachers. Each adviser works with about ten teachers, visiting, observing, demonstrating, coaching, and staying in telephone

contact. In addition, they conduct twice-weekly evening sessions for new teachers during their first semester. District policies and procedures are explained and experiences are shared.

The program was formally evaluated in 1982 by a joint SLTA/management team. The program received a strong endorsement from principals, new teachers, and the peer advisers. The SLTA president expressed the belief that the program would cut down on the number of unsuitable teachers entering the profession, if only because the close contact with seasoned mentors will give new teachers some awareness of their fitness to teach.

According to the program's leader, principals are notified when a new teacher is in serious trouble. In some cases, the new teacher has been put on remediation. The peer adviser program, like the review-of-services program, feeds into the evaluation system while at the same time fulfilling its own ostensible purpose.

Teacher Specialists and Program Development

Another contrivance, obliquely related to the teacher system, is a cadre of 40 teacher specialists who receive $590 annual stipends to serve as curriculum leaders during eight days of release time. Jointly chosen by management and the SLTA, they provide curricular expertise to both teachers and central office learning specialists who organize and serve on remediation teams. Teachers not on remediation may call on teacher specialists to help with needs assessment, evaluation of new curricula and field tests of materials, and teaching strategies. In addition, teacher specialists conduct in-service workshops for other teachers in their field of specialization.

The program reflects the superintendent's strong conviction that teachers never should have surrendered control over curriculum to administrators or publishers. He believes that today's teachers are as educated as most administrators and that previous curricular reform efforts failed because program designers were not fully aware of classroom realities.

Since Salt Lake virtually eliminated its central office curriculum staff, the teacher specialists cadre does the work once done by full-time curriculum supervisors. Taken as a whole, the teacher stipend

programs--teachers serving on remediation teams, the peer advisers who help beginning teachers, and the teacher specialists who work on curriculum--involve and give recognition to about 20) of Salt Lake's 1100 teachers.

Open Disclosure

Open Disclosure is the redundant name Thomas gives to the system's requirement that each teacher provide the parents of his or her students with a brief overview of the academic expectations for the class. An open disclosure document usually includes a description of the course, the course objectives, the variety of learning activities to be used, and any special rules or requirements. Although many school districts require teachers to explain the year's program to parents on back-to-school night, Salt Lake City has made systematic what is often haphazardly done elsewhere.

Through this device, parents (by virtue of their access to the review-of-services program) may theoretically hold teachers accountable for doing what they said they would do. At the same time, parents with unreasonable expectations for their childrens' accomplishments get a realistic picture of what can be learned in a given year or course.

School-Level Governance Bodies

Although not directly related to the teacher evaluation system, no description of the city's schools would be complete without an account of the school improvement councils and the school community councils. Although the words *school site governance* were never used by anyone we spoke to in Salt Lake, the authority granted to local faculties and communities closely resembles that concept. As would be true elsewhere, school-level decisionmaking, whether by the faculty or by the community, is constrained by the relevant federal laws and state education code, state ethics standards, and the board of education's system-wide budget control.

The school improvement council (SIC), the local faculty governing body, is established in the *Written Agreement*, which specifies the composition of the council's membership for elementary, intermediate, and high schools. The school's SLTA representative is always a member,

but to become a representative he or she must be selected from the total staff by nomination and vote of association members at an SLTA meeting. Other teachers who serve on the school improvement council are chosen by the local school faculty.

Any member of an SIC can introduce any items of business or point of view. The SIC can establish and implement programs for the school as long as they are consistent with board policy, are ratified by the total school faculty, and are approved by the superintendent (a legal formality). Members of the councils attend an annual workshop to learn their roles and responsibilities.

The SICs decide by consensus, although the building representative may poll the faculty on some issue to determine the sentiment of a majority of the teachers. Lacking consensus, SICs turn to parity voting. The principal has one vote, and the faculty as a whole has one vote. In this way, the principal theoretically cannot overwhelm the faculty by virtue of his authority, nor can the faculty overwhelm the principal with their numbers. This design places a premium on cooperation, compromise, and accommodation. It is intended to discourage power plays and hardening of positions. Unresolved matters are appealed to the superintendent.

The school community council (SCC), which operates on a similar relationship of parity between the faculty as a whole and the patrons as a whole, is meant to provide a cooperative means of improving the educational program. It gives parents some real authority over nontechnical matters, such as the opening and closing time of the school day, student safety policies, school rules, and which time slots shall be designated for teacher planning time. Again, consensus is the primary mechanism for reaching decisions, and the principal plays a key role in helping the group reach consensus. The faculty cannot overwhelm the parents by virtue of its professionalism, nor can the patrons overwhelm the school by virtue of their numbers.

The method for selecting community representatives on the SCC is noteworthy. The principal, the parent-teacher association (PTA) president, and the PTA vice-president each appoints one member, and these three appointees in turn appoint a member, thus providing a total community membership of nine persons. The faculty is represented by the

members of the school improvement council. The PTA-controlled appointment process was devised, according to several sources, so that Salt Lake City's traditionally strong PTA organization would not feel usurped by the introduction of school community councils.

Thomas recently moved to expand the decisionmaking powers of SCCs through a new governance mechanism called *curriculum equity*. In the elementary schools, the community will have equal say with the faculty on the staffing pattern. In practice, the community will have an opportunity to influence the school's choice of specialty positions, for example, whether the school should have a teacher of gifted children or a librarian. The idea was piloted in 1982-1983 in a few volunteer elementary schools, and the board recently adopted it for all elementary schools.

The import of the SICs and SCCs for teacher evaluation is that more teachers know about the work of other teachers because they are working together to make school decisions. These mechanisms may also inspire greater competence in the already adequate teachers. Also, more parents know the inner workings of the schools because they are brought into joint decisionmaking roles with the faculty. This greater knowledge and higher level of responsibility serves the dual purpose of reducing distrust and promoting accountability between parents and teachers. In such an open system, incompetent teachers are far more difficult to conceal and outstanding teachers are far more likely to rise to positions of influence in their schools.

IMPLEMENTATION IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT: HOW THE SYSTEM REALLY WORKS

Perceptions about all of Salt Lake's many processes vary widely according to school level (everything was more positive at the elementary level); according to individual attitudes toward power and responsibility (some people wanted more direction from the top while others chafed at the limitations on shared governance); and according to their degree of understanding of the process. Taking the various mechanisms one by one, the following picture emerges.

Accountability

At the elementary level, several respondents said that the board's system-wide goals were so vague and general that it was hard to see what purpose was served by the annual exercise between principals and teachers. School goals, however, were taken seriously in most schools. The process was not seen as a teacher evaluation system, but as a device for focusing on goals.

At the secondary level, teachers were more cynical, saying they thought the process was a farce. A number of teachers reported that they were never evaluated, and some said that the principal rarely came to their room. A few reported that some principals ignored evidence that board goals had not been met and filed positive reports with the central office in order to get their 2 percent salary increment. A few secondary teachers thought that the process had been a good one at the beginning, when the emphasis was on the teacher setting personal goals. When that aspect of the process became optional, they saw little point in the exercise.

Informal and Formal Remediation

Most principals and teachers agreed that principals hesitate to get involved in the remediation process, even at the informal stage. Nearly all principals acknowledged that some teachers on their staffs should be put on remediation, and nearly all teachers said that other teachers in their buildings needed to be helped or removed.

Principals gave many reasons for their hesitancy: they were new to their school and needed to build faculty support; they did not have time; they already had several teachers on remediation and did not want to risk a faculty rebellion as a result of their being seen as hostile to teachers; or they preferred to work quietly with a teacher needing help.

Although a few people considered remediation a positive process that either helped teachers improve or helped them find a more suitable line of work, most said that remediation was destructive to the reputation of the teacher even if the teacher successfully completes official remediation. Many believed that being put on remediation was

tantamount to being fired, although the statistics would refute such a despairing conclusion. During the nine years of the program, 70 teachers have been placed on formal remediation. Some teachers were reported to have quit rather than endure the process. Of that number, 33 are still teaching and 37 either quit or were terminated. We do not know how many were actually subject to the formal termination process.

The characteristics of a teacher evaluation system, even one that claims accountability as its primary purpose, cannot be described solely by the number of teachers removed from service. Qualitative issues must be considered also. On paper, Salt Lake's system is designed to catch all kinds of teacher incompetence, but in practice, it appears to be largely confined to catching those who cannot organize the day and keep the students working. Nearly all the teachers that have been removed or induced to leave have foundered on their lack of ability to manage a classroom rather than documented instructional ineffectiveness. Neither student outcomes nor the pedagogy specific to grade or subject matter seem to play a significant role in the teacher evaluation process.

Although the superintendent asserts that test scores in basic skills are part of the evaluation system, those most responsible for the process could recall no specific instance in which a teacher was placed on remediation for that reason until 1983. The two teachers put on remediation in 1983 had lower-than-expected student achievement. Principals may be prompted to place a teacher on remediation when his or her students are persistently below expected norms in basic skills, but once the remediation process is initiated, the teacher will be measured by evidence of progress in generic teaching competencies rather than increases in student learning.

Also, Salt Lake's evaluation system officially assesses neither the teacher's level of subject matter knowledge nor the ability to impart that knowledge. The list of teacher competencies are generic skills and knowledge that would be needed whether a teacher was assigned to teach first grade reading or advanced placement physics. While it is a feature of the remediation process to select a team member with an assignment similar to that of the teacher on remediation, most observers noted that the match between the two was often less than ideal. The SLTA-appointed team member responsible for the substance of remediation

is not always chosen on the basis of pedagogical sophistication, according to several respondents.

Furthermore, the five central office learning specialists must serve on a number of remediation teams simultaneously. The time that they can spend assessing the nuances of instruction is therefore limited. Also, the learning specialists must cover a fairly wide range of age-level and subject-matter curricula. The same specialist might serve, for example, on a remediation team for a junior high English teacher and a high school German teacher.

Thus, it would appear that the Salt Lake system assumes either that teachers know their subjects or that shortcomings of that type should be handled outside the teacher evaluation system. One participant in the remediation program summed up the viewpoint that seems to prevail: "If a teacher can get the attention of the class and maintain order, the teaching of subject matter falls into place. Teachers know their subject matter."

Others expressed the view that deficiencies in subject matter knowledge or presentation can be easily remedied by supervision or training, but that deficiencies in classroom management skills are less likely to yield to intervention because they are rooted in the teacher's personality. Presumably, a competent and caring principal can work with, or have others work with, a teacher whose lessons are developmentally inappropriate, or help a mathematics teacher whose explanations reach only a portion of the class. No evident, system-wide mechanism exists, however, for locating and helping teachers who can control a class but who lack knowledge, the ability to impart it, or enthusiasm for their discipline.

One might argue that Salt Lake's evaluation system, by tagging only those teachers who cannot meet the most basic prerequisites of effective teaching, can more effectively eliminate the truly unsuitable than a system with a more ambitious evaluation system. If general teacher improvement were sought in the context of remediation, the process might become too threatening to be useful.

Salt Lake City's evaluation system generates a high level of anxiety among its teachers, even though the system works only on the most conspicuously incompetent. Many teachers believe that a severe

stigma attaches to teachers on remediation. Because of the stigma, principals tend to wait until a situation is grave before putting a teacher on remediation, and because so many remediation efforts fail, the negative image is reinforced.

Donald Thomas believes that the anxiety generated by the process is not all bad. Mediocre teachers may work harder to avoid the psychic and real risks of remediation. And even teachers who saw the process as a negative one said that they would rather be judged by a team than by a single principal, and most were proud that their profession was engaged in cleaning its own house.

Peer evaluation thus appears to be a step in the right direction simply because it promotes teacher trust in the system and obviates most legal hassles. At its present stage of development, however, the remediation teams appear to be over-manned and, at the same time, under-funded. The team members have little time to spend with the teacher, and the qualifications and training of the evaluators are not subject to system-wide quality controls. The adequacy of assistance to teachers in trouble may, therefore, be a function of how many teachers are in the program at any given time, the luck of the draw in the staffing of teams, and the funds available to hire a fifth team member to provide more intensive support.

Review of Services

Opinions about the effects of the review-of-services program range between extremes. Some believe that it provides an excellent mechanism for spotting problems and resolving disputes; others consider it a toothless mechanism that allows people to "let off steam" but fails to solve problems; and still others see it as a threatening and humiliating process that leads almost inevitably to the loss of one's job.

Since few teachers or parents have an overview of the process, viewpoints are shaped by each person's limited experience with it or secondhand knowledge. Even a systematic survey of staff and public opinion would probably not yield a balanced account of the program's impact. Clearly, however, the process looms larger in people's minds than the statistics would indicate.

Review-of-services reports written by designated neutrals are usually tempered, finding a little fault on either side even when the facts do not appear to justify such evenhandedness. Some respondents asserted that the program was being used to retaliate; however, none could give a specific instance of a retaliatory request for review. Although negative findings about a teacher who is subjected to a review of services have sometimes led the principal to place the teacher on remediation, the viewpoint of the complaining parent (who feels that justice has been done) will differ from the viewpoint of the teacher (who feels that the parents lack the qualifications to judge teacher performance) or the principal (who has been embarrassed).

Even teachers who fear and dislike the process grudgingly prefer having it to not having it. The process effectively quells the gossip about teachers and principals that goes on in most school communities, as well as the covert actions of citizens to remove an educator seen as incompetent or disruptive. As the superintendent put it, "I don't think a democratic society can tolerate rumors or anonymous accusations." Citizens and staff members with complaints about services must now openly confront the person they believe responsible for a bad situation and must abide by the findings of a person conceded to be neutral.

Clearly, though, most teachers dread a parental complaint more than a criticism from a fellow professional. Parents who have tried it find the process either useless, chastening, or satisfying, depending upon the results. In the mind of the superintendent, it "neutralizes the principal's inability to act" by giving parents the power to expose poor teachers who have escaped the attention of the principal. Thus, the process supports the teacher evaluation system.

Shared Governance

Understanding of, and support for, shared governance is markedly better at the elementary school level than at the secondary level. Most elementary teachers feel that the school improvement councils give them a voice and force principals to consult them on any program changes. They see the school community councils as "people working together to solve problems."

Although some elementary principals have smarted over the loss of power, others have come to understand that sharing the decisions means sharing the blame. When the faculty and community have labored for consensus, they "own" the decision and are less likely to criticize the principal if the results are less than perfect. Elementary parents like shared governance also because their community leaders are privy to faculty discussions about policies and programs, and because they have equal power in deciding those policies that most affect their role as parents.

The most recent expansion of parent power--curriculum equity--now gives elementary parents some say in such choices as whether to reduce class size by hiring more regular teachers or to hire more specialists and allow regular classes to get larger. Many teachers criticize this new governance wrinkle because they believe that a majority of parents may make decisions that slight the educational needs of minority children, e.g., eliminate a bilingual position in favor of a gifted position. However, a few teachers expressed the view that their colleagues often have made staffing decisions to protect the jobs of colleagues rather than to meet the needs of students. They believe that parents are no less capable of making fair decisions than teachers.

At the intermediate and secondary levels, however, shared governance produces widespread discomfort. Although a few teachers say that it has public relations value, most teachers disapprove for one reason or another. Some call it "shoved governance," meaning that the sharing was a one-way street, with the central office, the board, or the principal either manipulating or arrogating the decisions. "They do whatever they want," said a number of teachers. In one instance cited, the board of education established the annual school calendar without the contractually required consultation with SLTA, at least in the view of some. The board's view was that the SLTA had, indeed, been consulted, but that the community's wishes had influenced the board more than the SLTA's.

Veto by higher authority is built into the process, however. When a school improvement council or a school community council cannot reach consensus, and when parity voting fails to produce agreement, the matter

is appealed to the superintendent and ultimately may be appealed to the board. And for legal reasons, remediation team or principal verdicts about teacher dismissals must be approved ultimately by the superintendent. The superintendent thus retains power over the most difficult and controversial decisions even as he presses his employees and constituents to work for consensus at the local level.

Furthermore, the board of education is specifically exempted from the shared governance system. A contract provision specifies that the board shall suffer no loss of authority except for those provisions that specifically delegate certain powers to the superintendent. However, the existence of shared governance surely inhibits the board's power in accordance with its own preferences.

In view of the stated limitations of shared governance, one may deduce that many secondary teachers fail to understand how the process is intended to work, are uncomfortable with the ambiguities it creates, or just do not accept the restraints inherent in it. One parent activist commented: "High school teachers want more power than the board is willing to give them."

Paradoxically, secondary teachers express an opposing line of criticism. Some believe that the system needs more direction from the top. Some believe that principals should run the show in their own schools. Some think the process is too cumbersome and complain that decisions never get made. Many complain that shared governance is an administrative attempt to avoid responsibility.

Superintendent Thomas cheerfully admits that he has moved many of the traditional responsibilities of his position onto the shoulders of others while still getting paid to do his job. He also observes: "Once they begin to experience the limits that frustrate us in central office, they begin to complain about central office passing the buck."

Shared governance can thus be seen in two ways. Under one view, it is an ingenious political strategy through which the superintendent exercises power without seeming to do so. Those who hold this view believe that shared governance is a masterful public relations strategy that keeps people busy making decisions that are either relatively unimportant or overturnable by the superintendent on appeal.

Under another view, shared governance is an entirely new form of school governance, now operating awkwardly because it is new, but a form that requires a traditionally passive teacher corps and parent body to act like adults and take responsibility for their own decisions. Those who hold this view see the alternating demands for more control or more freedom as a case of systemic adolescence. Where it is working well, distortions formerly caused by institutionalized adversarialism have given way to mutual persuasion and consensus-building; where it is not working well, people are having difficulty accepting new roles and responsibilities.

At its present stage of development, shared governance in Salt Lake City appears to be as concerned with *who* makes decisions as with *what* decisions are made. For example, the substance of the educational program has been given over to working teachers on the philosophical grounds that they are best suited to determine what is taught and how it is taught (working within the most general guidelines). But the system has provided only sketchy guidelines for elementary teachers, and none for secondary teachers. It has provided a cadre of 40 working teachers with only eight days of release time to help other teachers with curriculum development. It has created local school improvement councils, presumably with the hope that institutionalized collegiality at the school site will encourage teachers to work together to devise the instructional program most suited to the students at a given school.

While one might argue that collegial cooperation on curriculum in an actual school for actual children would be the best of all possible worlds, the SICs in Salt Lake have received no special allocations of time to accomplish the task that is done by full-time specialists in other districts. One might also argue that individualized, customized in-service training by the teacher specialists would be superior to scattered workshops and courses, but the eight days a year provided for this purpose seem to be an underfunded expression of the superintendent's conviction that individual teachers should be responsible for curriculum.

Further, the system's attempts at economies of scale has put pressure on local schools to select from one of three textbooks out of those approved by Utah's state adoption system. This regrettable fact, however necessary because of budget constraints, seems to belie Thomas's stated philosophy that teachers will be liberated from publisher, as well as administrator, domination.

Similarly, the teacher evaluation system seems as concerned with the philosophy of power-sharing as with the qualitative aspects of teacher performance. Remediation teams are designed to assure equal representation of management and labor and to combine due process protections with grade level/subject matter expertise. But the central office takes no responsibility for the quality of team members appointed by the SLTA, and members appointed by the administration are either stretched thin (like the learning specialists) or very busy (like the principals).

Shared governance gives Salt Lake parents more knowledge and leverage than most parents elsewhere. At the elementary level, because of the close-knit character of community-based parent bodies and faculties, parents have the necessary information to pinpoint weakness and the power to insist on improvements. At the secondary level, however, even well-informed and concerned parents may lack the information and expertise to know whether teacher skills are appropriate to the subject matter and developmental levels of the students, and teachers, because of their departmentalization, may lack knowledge about the performance of other teachers and the consistency and quality of the overall program.

THE FUTURE OF SHARED GOVERNANCE AND TEACHER EVALUATION

Because of Donald Thomas's highly personal style of leadership, the case study team probed for staff and citizen speculations about the future of Salt Lake City's approach to governance and evaluation if Thomas were to leave. Most respondents said that most aspects of the structure would survive Thomas's departure if only because few teachers and parents would be willing to give up the power that they now have. Also, the system has made visible improvements. Some poor teachers have

been removed. Student achievement has increased dramatically. Attendance is at 96.6. The dropout rate has been reduced from 20 percent to 5 percent. The system is more open, more service-oriented, and more public. The peer adviser team hopes to expand its nonthreatening services to experienced teachers needing help, as well as new teachers.

The superintendent, the PTA, and the SLTA have joined in support of a bill before the Utah legislature that would give local school districts the power to certify new teachers after two years of successful teaching experience. Plans are being made to develop curriculum guides for secondary schools. A board goal for 1983-1984 is to develop standard curriculum and district-wide testing at the secondary level. A budget of nearly $100,000 has been provided. These items are all signs that the system has served both public and profession, and that the system is vital enough to correct its deficiencies and refine its processes.

However, a few clouds have appeared on the horizon. Salt Lake City's reliance on release time for teachers performing various evaluation and assistance functions has drawn criticism from parents who find substitutes a poor substitute for regular teachers. Also, teachers in Salt Lake will receive no cost-of-living increase this year because of state and local revenue shortfalls. Those who dislike shared governance in the first place may now doubt Thomas's assurance that power sharing will result in more public support for education and higher salaries for teachers.

THE FIT BETWEEN MORMON CULTURE AND SHARED GOVERNANCE

Although Thomas's ideas about school governance were first suggested by Nierenberg[6] and were first tested elsewhere, the application of those ideas to Salt Lake City appears to be quite consonant with the organizational and relational styles his patrons are accustomed to. Thomas, like the hierarchy of the Mormon church, retains ultimate control and is unabashedly hortatory. The local school, like the local church, has much responsibility for its own affairs.

---

[6]Gerard I. Nierenberg, *The Art of Negotiating* (New York, Hawthorne Books, 1968).

Because ward activities encompass so much of a Mormon's life, church members are accustomed to undertaking many and varied responsibilities--social, cultural, educational, religious, supervisory, financial, and even artistic--and versatility is valued and developed. Similarly, in the school system, adults involved in local school governance bodies may be called upon to chair a council, arbitrate a dispute, chaperone school activities, raise funds, or render decisions on a variety of school policies and programs. Also, the culture avoids confrontation; consensus decisionmaking in the schools is quite compatible with community norms and temperament. So is the notion that a higher authority might ultimately reverse a local decision.

Shared governance takes a lot of time. Reaching consensus may require several meetings. In the family-centered culture of Salt Lake City, fathers and mothers are accustomed to spending a lot of time on their children. Shared governance thus takes advantage of, and depends on, cultural support for volunteerism, participation, and collective responsibility for child development.

The predominant culture and the school system's unusual governance system thus seem well adapted to one another. The fit between Thomas's contrivance and the culture of public education seems more difficult. According to Thomas, some principals still have difficulty contacting him directly because they are accustomed to a longer chain of command. Also, senior officials in the system were loath to give up the standard job titles in an educational bureaucracy. The SLTA, though generally supportive, is nevertheless uncomfortable with the fact that it simultaneously supports the removal of teachers deemed hopeless by its own representatives on remediation teams while continuing to provide funds for legal defense when teachers challenge the process.

WOULD IT WORK IN ANOTHER SETTING?

Sharing power with parents has been tried in many places over the past decades with varying success. The evident workability of shared governance in Salt Lake owes much to the homogeneity of the culture, or at least to the unintentional suppression of divergent groups.

In any school district not riddled with deep value conflicts about the purpose of schooling and the norms of personal behavior, sharing power with parents would probably work well as long as the delegation of authority to parents was specific and did not challenge legitimate professional prerogatives. Districts experiencing a crisis in confidence between the community and the schools might find some version of shared governance the best way to restore public trust in the schools and professional respect for parental values.

Sharing power between management and the teacher organization may be more difficult to achieve. If a board of education has a history of zealously guarding management rights and regards any surrender of power to teachers as a sign of weakness, then the board would probably resist the idea even if the expected benefits seemed desirable. Similarly, if the teacher organization has elevated adversarialism to a moral imperative, then shared governance would appear a sellout and would be resisted.

For many people, confrontation is the soul of democracy. They relish mobilizing supporters to outvote or outshout the opposition; they enjoy staging demonstrations; they regard petition drives and letter-writing campaigns as their God-given right under our system of government. Majority rule is a sacred principle.

Thomas may well be correct in his assessment that power tactics, hard-hosed bargaining, and abrupt shifts in policy resulting from leadership changes have not helped the schools. He may also have a point that even-numbered, rather than odd-numbered, deliberative bodies have a practical advantage because they must learn to listen to each other rather than overwhelm each other. But those who are wed to our traditional processes of decisionmaking will be hard to convince unless there is a charismatic, articulate leader pushing the idea.

EVALUATING THE TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

The stated purpose of the Salt Lake City teacher evaluation system is to help teachers who are in serious trouble and to remove them if they do not respond to the help. Judged by its own purpose and criteria, the system is a stunning success.

Since teachers on remediation are observed and helped by a team of peers and administrators with diverse loyalties and perspectives, the teacher being evaluated can be reasonably secure about the collective objectivity of the team. SLTA representatives on the team guarantee that the team sticks to the published criteria; management representatives on the team guard against unthinking loyalty to peers. The delicate political design ensures the validity of the Salt Lake process.

The reliability of the process is more difficult to assess because the nature of decentralizing school governance is antithetical to the notion of reliability. Nevertheless, the small pool of people representing the administration brings a measure of consistency to the process. SLTA-appointed members, however, are drawn from a large pool, and therefore bring a measure of inconsistency to the process if only because it is more difficult to assure consistent judgments from a larger group.

Principals vary in their willingness to put a teacher on remediation, and undoubtedly apply different standards from school to school. Principals also vary in their willingness to render the final verdict that remediation has failed, particularly in the case of older teachers near retirement. Finally, enough complaints were heard from non-Mormon teachers about favoritism toward Mormon teachers, particularly those supporting large families, to raise some doubts about the consistency of the process within and among schools.

The utility of the system--how expeditiously and efficiently it achieves its goals--gets mixed reviews. On the one hand, the system has removed over half the teachers placed on remediation and has theoretically restored the rest to satisfactory performance. The financial cost of the process is fairly low since it relies, in large measure, on the services of people receiving modest stipends or substitute pay. Although union leaders express some doubts about the system because they must live with the role conflicts inherent in it, teacher evaluation in the context of shared governance seems to raise a minimum of political hackles.

On the other hand, the near-universal opinion that many more teachers should be placed on remediation suggests that the anxiety created by an accountability-based approach curtails the extent to which it is used. The system at large and the principal in each building seemingly keep the exercise of the remediation process at the level of tension that can be tolerated.

The radical decentralization of the Salt Lake Public School System invites another approach to evaluating the teacher evaluation system. If teachers are assumed to be competent professionals until they are put on remediation, and if they are deemed to be the rightful interpreters of the most general curriculum guidelines, do they do a better job or feel that they are doing a better job because they are left alone?

The evidence suggests that Salt Lake teachers do, in fact, feel that they are doing a good job. As long as students are kept within the behavioral boundaries established by the surrounding culture, teachers feel free to respond to the teaching and learning challenges before them in a manner consistent with their own strengths, interests, and capabilities.

We heard virtually no complaints about paperwork, curricular requirements that were ill-suited to their students, or pressure to teach to the tests. Teachers can seek help if they want it, but it is not forced upon them. Teachers have collective power over policy and program in their local schools and feel reasonably secure in the notion that they cannot be overwhelmed by an arbitrary principal.

The evidence partly suggests that Salt Lake teachers, in fact, are doing a good job. Although marked discrepancies show up in student achievement between high- and low-status schools (a condition that nearly everybody saw as inevitable), the overall achievement of students is high for an urban district, as evidenced by college enrollment and advanced placement participation rates.

Academic success might also be attributed to strong family structure and the family's role in instilling good work habits early in a school child's life. No matter how important the family culture of Salt Lake City is in fostering student achievement, however, it cannot alone account for the large percentage of students who qualify for

advanced placement in college courses. Qualifying performance on those demanding examinations must rest on the particular teaching skills of high school teachers as well as the achievement orientation students bring with them to school. We can speculate that the teachers, like the parents, place a high value on industriousness, competition, and attainment in school.

The aspects of teaching measured by Salt Lake's evaluation system are limited to the irreducible minimum required for good teaching. The system is brought to bear only on those few whose performance is conspicuously troublesome; other teachers are left alone. The vast majority of teachers are assumed to possess adequate knowledge of subject matter and either to succeed in teaching it or to seek help.

The burdens of school and teacher improvement, then, have not been heaped on the teacher evaluation system. And unlike most school districts, which rely on centrally managed efforts to enhance teacher skills and school effectiveness, Salt Lake has chosen another path. Its hope for academic improvement appears to rest on the belief that empowerment of principals, teachers, and parents at the school level will indirectly result in excellence. A finely constructed set of checks and balances are expected to liberate the good judgment and energy of the parties closest to the instructional situation.

This experiment in improvement through governance has some foundation in recent educational history and research. Some degree of teacher autonomy appears to benefit both teachers and students. Centrally imposed curricula often fail to impress teachers. Central office accountability schemes sometimes result in teaching to the tests, or subtle sabotage. Finally, teacher evaluation systems that attempt to reconcile too many purposes often achieve none of them.

On the other side of the argument is the widely held belief that a problem is best solved through a direct attack; if student writing skills are deficient, then the system should mount a many-faceted program to improve teacher competence and student outcomes. One might argue that heightened parent power is no substitute for knowledgeable, professional leadership aimed directly at educational outcomes. One might also argue that teacher power at the local school level cannot substitute for the expertise and perspective that a critical mass of educational specialists in the central office can provide.

Whatever the outcome of Salt Lake City's unusual experiment, it remains a model for those who believe that two, or twenty, heads are better than one, that all interested parties need to have real (not just advisory) power, and that centralization, bureaucratization, and adversarialism have harmed schooling. Whatever the limitations of the teacher evaluation system, it also stands as a model for those who believe that teachers and their organizations can, and will, act in the best interests of students if they are given real responsibility, and a reproach to those who believe that teachers cannot, or will not, be professionally responsible.

II. THE LAKE WASHINGTON (WASHINGTON) SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 414 TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

Milbrey McLaughlin

REASONS FOR THE SELECTION OF LAKE WASHINGTON

Lake Washington (in Washington state) uses an ordinary teacher evaluation design. In form and structure, teacher evaluation in this Pacific Northwest school district resembles teacher evaluation throughout the country, using virtually the same checklists, the same assessment categories, the same requirements for pre- and postobservation conferences.[1]

Despite its formal resemblance to typical teacher evaluation strategies, however, teacher evaluation in Lake Washington stands out in several respects. For one, district teachers and administrators report that teacher evaluation is practiced uniformly across district schools. This uniformity contrasts markedly with the uneven activities typically associated with teacher evaluation.[2]

Teacher evaluation in Lake Washington also differs from other such systems in that it is *used*. It plays a central role in formulating the "personal growth plans" required of all district teachers. In addition, teacher evaluation forms the core of a district management strategy that has resulted in the "counseling out" of approximately 5 percent of the district's teaching staff over a four-year period.

---

[1]See, for example, B. Lewin, "Teacher Evaluation--A Review of the Research," *Educational Leadership*, December 1979; K. Peterson and D. Kauchak, "Teacher Evaluation: Perspectives, Practices and Promises," Center for Educational Practice, Graduate School of Education, University of Utah, January 1982.

[2]See, for example, the critiques in Jason Millman (ed.), *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, Calif., 1981.

Finally, Lake Washington considers teacher evaluation an integral part of an overall plan for staff development, evaluation, and planning.[3] Since its inception five years ago, the overall plan has contributed to a 20-percentile gain in student achievement scores (bringing the district from the middle to second from the top in state achievement score rankings) and to a marked increase in public support for the schools, as seen in a high level of volunteerism and parent involvement and voter approval of tax levies and school bond issues.

In short, although it looks the same, teacher evaluation in Lake Washington differs notably from the desultory, variable, and largely symbolic activity that passes for evaluation in most school districts. Lake Washington is included in this study to allow exploration of the factors and forces that make this teacher evaluation strategy unusual.

THE POLICY CONTEXT

Lake Washington School District No. 414, the fourth largest district in the state of Washington, serves the 18,000 students who live in the bedroom communities of Kirkland, Redmond, and Juanita. Residents of the district, which is just across the lake from Seattle, commute to jobs in aerospace, insurance, banking, computer technology, and the like. The sprawling, 75-square-mile district is predominantly white (around 8 percent minority) and middle class (only 1 percent of its students meet eligibility criteria for participation in federal compensatory education programs).

Lake Washington spends $2400 annually (somewhat above the state average) to education each student, and its approximately 1000 teachers are among the highest paid in the state, at an average yearly salary of $25,000. Parents have high expectations for the schools and attend closely to school performance.

---

[3]Our preliminary investigation of teacher evaluation practices across the country showed that few districts coordinate either the planning for or the results of their teacher evaluation with other district activities, even the most obviously relevant, such as staff development and instructional planning.

The district faces both rising student enrollment and constrained resources. The district is growing by approximately 250 students a year; at the same time, its fiscal resources are declining because of Washington's general economic downturn. A recent court case involving school financing, however, led to the state's assumption of a larger share of public education costs. This equity-producing measure couples state and local fortunes and reduces the need for local revenue-raising activities. As a result, the district has been able to continue the comprehensive level of services previously provided as the pupil population increased.

Central office administrators report that despite growing enrollments and limited resources, Lake Washington is in better fiscal shape than any other district in the state. They attribute this enviable state to the "financial wizardry" and management approach of Superintendent L. E. (Bud) Scarr, who also plays the leading role in the district's teacher evaluation story.

Getting Rid of the Deadwood: A Mandate for Change

Bud Scarr arrived in Lake Washington in 1977 to face acrimony and turmoil among the staff, substantial dissatisfaction among district parents, pressure to "get rid of the deadwood," and adversarial relations between the teacher union and administration. A popular interim superintendent had been fired; several administrators threatened resignation to protest his dismissal and Scarr's appointment; a pending school board recall action charged the board with the abuse of power in firing the superintendent.

Scarr agreed to take the Lake Washington job on the condition that the board accept what Scarr called his management plan and his absolute control in identifying strategies to achieve district goals. He told the board:

> I'm in control. You set policy, but that policy must be based on the district's priorities. After those priorities are agreed on, I'll see that the policies for implementing them are implemented.[4]

---

[4]B. Parker, "Bud Scarr: This Feisty Superintendent Thrives on Tough Decisions," *The Executive Educator*, May 1981, p. 13.

Scarr's management plan stressed a strong staff development program, or, as he put it, "the development of the most important asset that any school district has--people."[5] Scarr's belief in the primacy of people to a high-quality education drives his overall management philosophy:

> Hire the best, train the heck out of them, provide them with a clear framework of goals and expectations. . . . We all know what makes a difference in educating children is not the facilities, not the organizational structure, materials, curricula, etc., but rather the people who interact daily with children . . . as long as people make the crucial difference in education, the development of people is vital.[6]

When Scarr arrived, he put this statement into practice by telling every administrator in the system: "None of you has a job. I will interview you and determine who's employed." By this process, Scarr eliminated 33 central office positions, thereby saving approximately $700,000, which was then allocated for intensive staff development programs--a key component of his management plan.

A colleague noted that Scarr "came in here like a bulldozer. It looked almost ruthless. But Bud's attitude was that [the effect of] his plan and the changes [on the future of the district] were more important than their effect on individual people."[7] This single-mindedness on the part of the superintendent and the board's commitment to abide by his plan define school operations and teacher evaluation practices in Lake Washington.

---

[5]Ibid.

[6]Lake Washington's hiring practices under Scarr are highly specified. They emphasize quantitative and qualitative evidence of professional competence (a series of screening tests, personal interviews, interviews with past employers and, in the case of administrative personnel, visits to the candidate's former district to speak with administrators, teachers, and parents) as well as evidence that the candidate subscribes to the district's philosophy.

[7]Ibid.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING

As a result of Scarr's reorganization, Lake Washington has an extremely light central office staff--seven directors in addition to the superintendent and his deputy. The authority and control ostensibly lost by reducing central office staff purportedly is retained in Scarr's plan by extremely clear annual goals and performance standards for every position in the district, including his own.

The board meets with Scarr and his deputy superintendent, James Hager, for two days each year to set district goals and priorities for the coming year. Goals are set in nine broad areas: Futures, Instruction, Staff Development, Personnel, Special Services, Vocational Technical Institute, Planning and Evaluation, Communication, and Business and Operations. Each broad goal is broken down into subgoals that include performance guidelines and time lines.[8] The framework outlined in the annual district goal statement becomes Scarr's job description.

Scarr reports to the board four times a year--twice in writing and twice orally--on how each goal and performance standard is being achieved. This same procedure applies to every administrator in the Lake Washington district. Principals, for example, must set building goals based on the priorities jointly established by Scarr, Hager, and the board. The time lines and criteria associated with each become the principal's job statement for the year. Central office elementary and secondary education directors, in turn, are responsible for monitoring the achievement at each school building.

---

[8]For example, Goal 4 under Staff Development states: A comprehensive program to train staff about [computer] awareness and literacy will be provided. Subgoal 4.1 states: By September 1983, a series of in-service modules on microcomputer awareness and literacy will be developed. Specific areas of interest shall include: Introduction to Microcomputers; Selecting and Evaluating Software; Applications in Education; Introduction to "Popular" Software; Use of Existing Software; and Keyboarding.

Or, Goal 3 under Personnel states: The process for the selection of certificated staff will be updated and further developed. Subgoal 3.1 says: By July 1983, the upated process for certificated staff selection shall be completed. This will include revised coding manuals for all certificated administrators. See "1983-84 District Goals, Lake Washington School District No. 414."

These district priorities and goals result from an extraordinarily rationalized process of needs assessment, planning, evaluating, and monitoring. For example, the district has conducted a school climate survey, a parent survey, a student needs assessment, and a task analysis of administrative functions at the building level. Planning sessions are keyed to these information-gathering exercises, and the district broadly disseminates the results of their various fact-finding activities as well as of the district action taken in connection with each analysis. (In fact, one of the few new positions that Bud Scarr created was that of public information officer.)

The result of this management strategy is unusual clarity and consistency concerning district goals and priorities among district administrators at all levels of the system--little if any ad hoc policy is made at middle or lower levels of the system. Yet staff see substantial room for professional judgment and responsibility. One principal put it:

> There is enormous practical autonomy in this district, but goals and missions are very clear. We are given a lot of space but we are held accountable. The message from Bud is "Do it any way you want, but do it."

Another said:

> The superintendent gave principals high and tough goals. But he also gave them the tools to meet them. Bud set up operating procedures so we know exactly what to do. It is very clear what is expected of us and our staff.

Teacher evaluation is a major and explicit component of these building goals. Scarr has insisted upon an evaluation process that is real; indeed, principals are assessed on the extent to which they fulfill their evaluation responsibilities. The director for personnel and staff development succinctly summed up the district's position:

> We believe that principals should be responsible for helping people get better and for evaluating them. This can happen if the principal believes that (1) we will check and (2) we will provide help and support.

Both the teacher evaluation system and principals' function in the process are closely tied to Lake Washington's staff development activities, which lie at the heart of the district's approach to improving educational services. According to Scarr, "staff development is not a luxury; it's a necessity." Lake Washington probably spends proportionately more on staff development--$750,000 in 1982-1983 and $1 million in 1983-1984 from a budget of approximately $52 million--than any other district in the country. Teacher evaluation practices can be understood only in this context.

Training Winners

Lake Washington staff at all levels hold a remarkably consistent view concerning district expectations for personal growth. In one way or another, teachers and administrators throughout the system said, "The expectation here is that you will keep growing, get better--or get out." Scarr calls it "training winners." The intensive staff development activities supporting that commitment include the following eight components, the first four of which are closely tied to the teacher evaluation program:[9]

- Teacher Instructional Development
- In-Service Training
- Individual and School/Department Staff Development Programs
- Administrator Development
- School Board Development

---

[9]The district's staff development program is described in detail in Bettie B. Young and James L. Hager, "A Cooperative Plan for Personal and Professional Growth in Lake Washington School District," *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 1982, pp. 415-416.

- Classified Staff Development
- Parent Development
- General Growth

Teacher Instructional Development utilizes Madeline Hunter's "Instructional Theory Into Practice" (ITIP) strategies. ITIP provides training in elements of good teaching, such as student feedback, establishing behavioral objectives, and so on. Participation in ITIP is not required, but strongly encouraged by building administrators. In fact, principals are evaluated on the percentage of teacher attendance from their building. Teachers receive released time for attendance. Since 1977, more than 95 percent of the teaching staff has participated in at least one 30-hour ITIP training program. Most teachers have done more than one ITIP sequence.

In addition to training sessions, the district supports five ITIP trainers (selected from among the district's teaching staff). Their major responsibility is to demonstrate ITIP principles in classrooms and to provide on-call assistance to teachers and principals. In 1983-1984, the number of ITIP trainers will be raised to seven.

District ITIP trainers are supported by an ITIP satellite teacher in each school. These teachers have regular classroom responsibilities but receive training equivalent to that of the ITIP trainer and are paid a stipend to assist teachers in their building on request. They are given release time to provide this assistance. ITIP trainers are regarded as a crucial resource by principals in meeting their staff development and evaluation responsibilities.

Teachers at all levels of the system believe that ITIP simply incorporates and specifies notions of good teaching practice--things a good teacher should do anyway--and they like it because it contributes to their classroom effectiveness. Teachers have said, for example:

- It puts everything together so you can use it.
- I learned more [about teaching] from ITIP than in a semester university course.

- The emphasis on ITIP is excellent. Now when a lesson flops, I have a name for it. ITIP makes me a much better diagnostician.

In-Service Training. All teachers are required to attend in-service training programs (in addition to ITIP). Programs are designed to address areas mandated by law or by the district, including curriculum or program development activities. Major in-service programs conducted in 1982-1983 included: health education, effective schools research, computers in instruction, multicultural curriculum, and affirmative action. Nine credits are required. Attendance may be required as part of an individual growth plan.

Individual/School Staff Development Programs. The district requires that each teacher develop, with a supervisor, an individual growth plan for the year. These plans include seminars selected from the staff-development catalogue or other development activities (e.g., courses from nearby universities) based on needs as identified in teacher evaluation.

Each school building also must develop a plan for staff development. Each school receives a categorical allocation of approximately $1500 per year for staff development at the building level. Staff in each building appoint a staff development planning team, which is responsible for developing the building program. Each building plan must be approved by the director of Staff Development and Personnel Services. In addition to these building-wide activities, these categorical funds also provide a resource that principals may use in formulating development opportunities for particular teachers.

Administrator Development. The amount of time and resources devoted to administrator development in Lake Washington is unusual. All district administrators attend a two-week growth and development workshop each August. Follow-up seminars are held approximately once a month through the year. The August workshops have focused specifically on ITIP principles and concomitant clinical supervision skills, evaluation methods, and topical areas reflecting district goals. The clinical supervision skills acquired by district administrators play a central role in teacher evaluation practices.

THE TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

Evaluation Design

Lake Washington's teacher evaluation design was established before Bud Scarr became superintendent. The present format was included in the 1976 teacher contract as a response to the state's 1976 personnel evaluation mandate, SHB 1364, *Revised Codes of Washington* (RCW) 28A.67.065. The purpose of Lake Washington's evaluation system is instructional improvement. This purpose reflects the state position on the role of teacher evaluation: "The primary purpose for evaluation is to increase the opportunities for [teacher] learning through the improvement of instruction/professional performance."

The district-adopted evaluation format also directly tracks state-specified minimum criteria. The state's 1976 evaluation mandate required the superintendent of public instruction to establish teacher evaluation practices. The superintendent's subsequent seven minimum criteria were incorporated wholesale into Lake Washington's 1976 agreement with the education association and have remained in this form ever since. As required by the state, the Lake Washington evaluation process assesses the following seven minimum criteria of teacher performance:

- Instructional skill
- Classroom management
- The handling of student discipline and attendant problems
- Interest in teaching pupils
- Effort toward improvement when needed
- Knowledge of subject matter
- Professional preparation and scholarship

State mandates also specify the evaluation process. Each teacher must be observed at least twice during the school year; total observation time for each teacher must be not less than 60 minutes. Pre- and postobservation conferences also are required by SHB 1364, RCW 28A.67.065.

The district evaluation committee composed of administrators and teacher representatives that met in 1976 to establish Lake Washington's evaluation practice accepted the state framework without modification. Their only action was to elect a modified checklist approach that defined three outcome categories--satisfactory, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory--with room for a line of evaluator comments. The rationale, according to a teacher who was part of that team, was to minimize possible harm: "When the evaluation system was put together, S/US seemed the least damaging strategy from the perspective of teachers." In addition to the detailed checklist completed for each observation, Lake Washington also uses a summary evaluation report which aggregates evaluator assessments for the year.[10]

In form and structure, then, the Lake Washington evaluation system deviates little from that mandated by the state and from practices in place around the country. The district's evaluation activities merit note in the way they are carried out and used.

The Evaluation Process

Shortly after school opens each fall, the principal holds a staff meeting to explain the criteria against which teachers will be evaluated and to answer questions.[11] Following this staff meeting, principals (and in the case of the secondary schools, vice principals) schedule appointments with teachers for their preobservation conferences and classroom observation. The preobservation enables the teacher and principal (or other administrative evaluator) to discuss teacher goals for the classroom, gives teachers the opportunity to indicate the areas on which they would like their evaluator to focus, and allows the exchange of other information that the teacher or evaluator believes will be important to the observation.

---

[10]See Appendix A, pp. 69-72, for district evaluation instruments.

[11]In the past year or so, some principals have modified this procedure at the request of their staff to include full briefings about evaluation only for teachers new to the district or building. Teachers felt that they had been through the process enough times to understand it thoroughly.

Evaluator observation time ranges from a minimum of 30 minutes to the entire class period. During this time, the evaluator makes extensive notes about specific teacher activities and records examples of classroom practices that will support evaluator judgments. Following the observation, the evaluator completes the observation form and returns it to the teacher. (State law requires that these observation assessments be completed within three days.) A postobservation conference is scheduled immediately.

If a teacher receives a satisfactory rating in all areas, this conference ends his or her involvement in the evaluation process until the spring observation period. If, however, a teacher receives a "needs improvement" or an "unsatisfactory" rating in any area, the principal (or evaluator) will outline a mandated personal plan for development. This plan typically includes a request that district ITIP trainers work with the teacher in the classroom to improve teaching practices, as well as teacher attendance at specified district in-service workshops (for example, classroom management or human relations skills). Individual plans also have included recommendations of particular books or articles to be read and have indicated how the principal will be directly involved in the improvement process.

The principal also establishes a plan for informal observation, whereby he or she drops in unannounced to observe teacher activities and note improvement. In short, substantial resources are brought to bear immediately for staff judged to need improvement. The ITIP trainers have a particularly supportive relationship with teachers in these circumstances. Union contract forbids ITIP trainers to discuss teacher progress or problems with their administrators or to testify at dismissal hearings. Thus, the district has created an assistance situation of minimum threat to teachers.

If these efforts do not, in the judgment of the evaluator, result in improved and satisfactory performance, the teacher is then placed on probation. The extraordinarily time-consuming probationary procedures are specified by state law:

> Every employee whose work is judged unsatisfactory based on district evaluation criteria shall be notified in writing of stated specific areas of deficiencies along with a suggested specific reasonable program for improvement on or before February 1st of each year. A probationary period shall be established beginning on or before February 1st and ending no later than May 1st. The purpose of the probationary period is to give the employee opportunity to demonstrate improvements in his or her areas of deficiency. . . . During the probationary period the evaluator shall meet with the employee at least twice monthly to supervise and make a written evaluation of progress, if any, made by the employee.

The district's contract requires that the principal (or unit administrator responsible for evaluation) meet with the employee judged unsatisfactory within ten days of the date of the formal evaluation in an attempt to resolve matters. The employee may include a teacher association representative in this meeting. If the teacher is being considered for probation, a recommendation for probationary status must be made to the superintendent not later than January 20.

The recommendation for probation must include:

1. The evaluation report
2. Specific statements about the levels of performance that would be considered acceptable
3. A specific plan of action designed to assist the teacher in improving areas of unsatisfactory performance.

The mandatory plan of assistance must contain:

1. A description of the condition that needs to be changed
2. Clear expectations of what acceptable performance would be
3. A plan for achieving the desired expectations
4. A system for monitoring teacher progress and indicators of success
5. Resources needed
6. The date by which the plan must be complete.

If the superintendent concurs with the evaluator's recommendation for probation, a letter is sent to the teacher notifying him or her of probationary status and outlining specific areas of performance deficiencies. The letter also includes a list of expectations for improvement, a statement indicating the duration of the probationary period, and a program for assistance by the principal (or immediate supervisor) indicating how the teacher will be assisted in improving performance.[12]

In broad outline, the process of probation, observation, and remediation is prescribed by state law and operates in similar fashion throughout the state. However, principals indicate that Lake Washington's practices differ from those of other districts in at least two important respects. First, because of the district's investment in staff development and commitment to "train teachers to be winners first, not drum them out," substantial resources are available to principals (or other unit administrators) for planning and monitoring a teacher's probationary period.

In addition to regularly scheduled district in-service education courses, which an evaluator may require if he thinks that they are needed, each school building has its own discretionary in-service education budget (approximately $30 per teacher or $1500 per school). A principal may allocate a portion of these funds for further education (at the nearby University of Washington, for example) relevant to the plan of assistance for that teacher.

In the view of principals, however, the ITIP trainers offer the best help. At the request of a principal, an ITIP trainer will work on a one-to-one basis with a probationary teacher, focusing intensively on areas judged unsatisfactory. As one principal put it: "ITIP trainers provide a crucial element in the system. They cannot be used to 'get' teachers. Thus they provide a critical element of trust. Teachers know they can grow and make mistakes." In other words, teachers do not feel threatened by the trainers. Another stressed the importance of ITIP's

[12]See Appendix B for examples.

diagnostic character: "ITIP really has made a tremendous difference [in helping teachers improve]. When a teacher is not very good, it doesn't help to say 'I don't know why.'"

The superintendent's commitment to the process and his support of principals' decisions concerning probation, according to the principals interviewed, further distinguish the Lake Washington system. Before Scarr headed the Lake Washington district, few if any teachers received "unsatisfactory" or "needs improvement" ratings and few were placed on probation. In the first place, probation and low ratings were enormously time-consuming for the responsible building administrator. But more important, principals had no confidence that their decisions about unacceptable performance would be supported by the superintendent.

Decisions about teacher probation are inherently political; in placing a teacher on probation, a principal risks problems with the teachers' association as well as parents or community members who may believe a teacher has been judged wrongly. Regarding Scarr's support of principals who have to make politically tough decisions, one central office administrator said: "We prove to principals that when they take difficult action, the superintendent won't leave them out on a limb. This superintendent is willing to take this on."

Lake Washington teacher evaluation practices provide many examples that underscore leadership and commitment--rather than formal procedures--as crucial elements in an effective evaluation system. Teachers, principals, and district administrators emphasized this repeatedly and pointed to the change in teacher evaluation and probation that has come about since Scarr came to the district. For example, a principal said:

> Five years ago, evaluation was a waste of my time. No good could come of it, either in terms of providing help or in terms of moving ineffective teachers out. Since Bud Scarr has been here, he bought into the "teeth" [implicit in the state legislation] and really moved on evaluation [as an administrative tool]. He took the position that you *can* get rid of people. He gave principals the backing to do a good job of evaluation and provided the tools in terms of staff development support for tough decisions to do the job. We know he won't back off for political reasons.

The superintendent's commitment to a strong evaluation process also shows in the fact that administrators at all levels of the system spend more time on evaluation than do their counterparts in other districts. Deputy superintendent James Hager estimates that central office staff spend approximately 20 percent of their time on teacher evaluation concerns. Most of that time, Dr. Hager adds, is spent on marginal staff--observing them in the classroom and conferring with principals about appropriate plans of action. The directors of elementary and secondary education also are responsible for ensuring that principals know the correct procedures to be followed in the process of probation and termination and that the necessary information is gathered.

A recent analysis of principals' time commitments shows that elementary principals spend an average of 26 percent of their time on evaluation; secondary administrators are involved with evaluation 15 percent of their time.[13] Most districts devote substantially less time than Lake Washington to teacher evaluation.

As further evidence of Lake Washington's commitment to evaluation, both elementary and secondary administrators indicated that ideally they would prefer to spend more time on evaluation. Elementary administrators thought that 30 percent of their time should be devoted to evaluation; secondary administrators indicated that they thought 24 percent would be an ideal allocation of time to staff evaluation.

Outcomes of Evaluation

Administrators, teachers, board members and parents agree that the teacher evaluation system as it operates under Superintendent Scarr has resulted in substantial personnel change and improvement in classroom practices. Before Scarr and his staff assigned priority to teacher evaluation and devoted resources to it, principals and teachers alike viewed the procedure as a pro forma exercise undertaken to fulfill state requirements. Not unexpectedly, more than 99 percent of the teachers received "satisfactory" ratings. Not one teacher had been dismissed on

---

[13]See J. L. Hager and L. E. Scarr, "Effective Schools--Effective Principals: How to Develop Both," *Educational Leadership*, February 1983, pp. 38-40.

the grounds of incompetence. Hager said that he could not recall a single teacher being placed on probation prior to Scarr's arrival.

Since Scarr's arrival in 1977, the district's overall attrition rate has ranged from a low of 4.5 percent to a high of 6 percent of the teaching staff (or 41 to 60 teachers) who have left the district in a given year. Because Scarr and Hager wanted a precise account of the effects of the staff development/evaluation activities that they supported, the district has kept detailed records on personnel actions versus simple attrition. According to Hager's records, approximately 20 percent to 50 percent of those who leave within a given year represent "personnel actions" resulting from poor evaluations.[14]

The table shows the distribution of teacher personnel action across a range of possible outcomes. According to the table, the contract of only one teacher on probation has not been renewed under Scarr's tenure. Although the teachers' organization appealed this action routinely, its leadership indicated that it did not fight the nonrenewal because the district's case was so well documented--a product of the evaluation process as it has operated since 1977.

District administrators agree, however, that nonrenewals do not represent desirable personnel actions from their perspective. They prefer counseling out, strategies for which have been a focus of the August administrator retreats.

Principals agree that the evalution process as it currently operates in Lake Washington has been crucial to the counseling-out process. Most particularly, principals point to their training in clinical supervision as necessary to an effective counseling-out strategy. This training enables principals to provide teachers with specific feedback and a common language in which to discuss areas of weakness. Administrator criticism is thus more understandable and credible to teachers. And because district procedures require administrators to document problem areas at a high level of specificity, the criticism is also less debatable. (See, e.g., the detailed account of classroom practices provided in Appendix B, pp. 73-87.)

---

[14]We are grateful to Dr. Hager for the data on the distribution of teacher departures related to teacher evaluation.

Table

TEACHER PERSONNEL ACTION IN THE LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT, 1977-1983

	Action Category[a]										
Year	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	Total
77-78	6	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	12
78-79	6	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	12
79-80	4	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	15
80-81	2	4	1	0	2	0	1	1	0	5	16
81-82	4	2	3	0	8	2	0	1	5	0	25
82-83	2	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	7	0	16
Total	24	9	7	3	22	3	1	6	12	9	96

[a] Category key:

A = End-of-year resignation due to counseling out
B = Midyear resignation due to counseling out
C = Probation teachers who were reinstated following improvement
D = Probation teachers who resigned during or following probation
E = Teachers who retired following counseling
F = Teachers on leave of absence who resigned
G = Probation teachers who were not renewed
H = Teachers given disability leave who resigned at the end of leave
I = Teacher given medical leave or leave of absence following counseling
J = Noncontinuing contract teachers who were not rehired

Teachers who participated in this study agreed that district administrators make a genuine and a concerted effort to improve performance judged deficient. Thus, if despite their substantial effort, the teacher's classroom performance fails to improve, the teacher is more likely to accept the suggestion that he or she seek another vocation. To this point, one principal who has counseled out seven teachers in the past five years commented that "with only one exception, they all left with a smile."

The teacher evaluation system has, by broad agreement, worked to meet community demands that the district get rid of the deadwood. Community satisfaction on this point, and with the schools generally,

can be seen in the fact that during the turmoil and dissatisfaction that preceded Scarr's appointment, the Citizens' Advisory Council (CAC) membership held at more than 70. According to the present board president, who was a member at that time, CAC membership ran high because dissatisfaction ran high. Active CAC membership has dropped to under 20.

The board president, as well as central office administrators, believe that Lake Washington has been more successful than other Washington districts in using teacher evaluation to remove incompetent teachers. To this point, a central office administrator with long tenure in the district quipped: "We have fewer turkeys than any other district in the state."

The current CAC president believes, however, that district estimates of remaining deadwood are too low and puts this population at 5 percent of the present teaching staff. But, he notes also that before Scarr, "none were weeded out." In addition to counseling out teachers, the evaluation system has resulted in a number of teachers receiving explicit attention each year. Currently, for example, four or five teachers are on formal probation and around fifteen are on a mandatory personal growth plan.

The broad goal of teacher evaluation in Lake Washington--through counseling out, or terminating or improving ineffective teachers--is the improvement of classroom instruction. Both supporters and detractors of Scarr's regime agree that the general level of classroom instruction has improved under his management philosophy.

In many if not all schools, the teacher evaluation system has contributed importantly to this improved level of classroom practice. First, the way teacher evaluation is conducted underscores the administration's explicit commitment to improved instruction and staff performance. As one teacher said: "Teachers can't hide in this district. It is a vital, vibrant district; it is real clear to teachers that you have to cut the mustard or get out." Another said: "The district now has the tone that this is a place with high expectations and the ability to get people there."

Second, the evaluation process provides a vehicle for the district's emphasis on clinical supervision and principal responsibility for ensuring the quality of instruction in the school. It also serves as a triggering device for ITIP training. To this point, a probationary teacher who received heavy assistance (and who had received only a satisfactory rating from her previous administrator) believes that it has made a substantial difference in classroom practice and that it resulted in her own improvement. In her words,

> Using evaluation together with ITIP puts words on problems. It provides a model to go by and makes expectations clear. I know what to work on now; I have a clear notion of what my problem areas are. (Concerning her own documented improvement) I don't think all of this would have happened without evaluation.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE LAKE WASHINGTON SYSTEM

Teachers, principals, central office administrators, and community members agree to an unusual extent about the strengths and weaknesses of the district's evaluation system. Similarly, their suggestions for change and improvement are highly consistent.

Strengths

Almost all respondents agree that the procedures used for teacher evaluation in the district are highly reliable, both within and among schools. In the view of teachers, union representatives, and administrators, evaluator assessments are consistent across classrooms and over time. According to the union president, teachers consider only four or five principals in the district to be inconsistent or unfair. In the main, teachers believe that evaluation standards are consistently applied.

Lake Washington thus has overcome a problem that plagues teacher evaluation in many districts--the fact that a teacher's evaluation often depends upon who is conducting it. Too often, teacher assessments reflect the biases and perspectives of individual evaluators rather than a standard applied uniformly to teachers throughout the district. Lake Washington has resolved this through intensive evaluator training in clinical supervision.

Teachers also see the evaluation system as focusing on aspects of the *process* of good teaching (viz., setting behavioral objectives, monitoring student progress, adjusting levels of difficulty, etc.) while allowing considerable individual variation in style and content. These teachers believe that because the evaluation system transcends particular subject matter or grade level differences, the procedures are equally applicable at the secondary and elementary levels, and to reading instruction as well as civics. To this point, one building teacher representative said:

> Most teachers are happy with the process. They feel fairly well protected. It is an objective process that eliminates some of the bias that might otherwise exist. For example, I got a good evaluation this year even though my supervisor does not agree with my philosophical approach. The way the process is conducted in this district, those things get untangled.

A number of teachers described the feedback that they received from their evaluator in the evaluation process as helpful and a positive contribution to their professional growth. For example, one junior high school teacher said: "I learned more from one hour of my vice-principal's observation than I did from twelve days of university professors sitting in when I was a practice teacher."

Respondents explain these system strengths in terms of two factors: (1) district commitment to a strong teacher evaluation system and (2) the staff development opportunities afforded administrators and teachers. Scarr and his central office team have clearly told principals that strong teacher evaluation has high priority and that they will be evaluated in terms of how well they carry it out. As one principal put it: "The district is really pressuring us to do it right." Principals also clearly understand that the district has little sympathy for the "role conflict" problems (for example, How can I be a colleague and an evaluator?) that are raised in other districts to explain weak teacher evaluation practices. The school board president stated emphatically:

> The principal is the *manager* of the building, not the administrator. He is paid to make tough [personnel] decisions. His job is to make sure the kids get a good education, not to make the teachers happy. This kind of accountability has to go right up through the system to the board.

If the principals feel pressed to "do it right," they also believe that the district has given them the tools to do it with. In the view of both teachers and administrators, the most important tool is the training in clinical supervision regularly provided in the annual August workshops.

Through simulation, role modeling, video tapes, and other devices, administrators get extensive training in clinical observation, notetaking, reporting, and conference skills. They also receive ongoing instruction in ITIP principles, which provide a common framework for evaluation. These activities promote uniform evaluation practices across classrooms. Further, because evaluator training focuses on clinical observation of the teaching *process*, individual evaluator biases are mediated and agreement among raters about teacher performance has increased.

As important as this common framework is the common language that the district's staff development activities (ITIP in particular) provide for teachers and administrators. Because of their training, evaluators are able to speak clearly and specifically to teachers. Evaluators thus are able to move beyond global statements about teacher performance (for example, Keep up the good work!) to discuss particular concepts of classroom practice and provide teachers with concrete examples gathered during observation (e.g., pointing out that a teacher spends most of her time teaching to one side of the classroom). Finally, many teachers--particularly new ones and those who were seen as relatively weak--praise district evaluation practice for its positive orientation and focus on improvement.

Weaknesses

Not surprisingly, many perceived weaknesses in district evaluation practices are the reverse of the perceived assets. For example, a number of principals and teachers complained about the system's positive orientation. At least one-third of the teachers and three-quarters of the principals whom we interviewed consider the present system insufficiently critical. They believe that the positive approach stressed by the administrators and the ITIP model diminishes the value and the credibility of the process for many teachers.

One teacher, who had been responsible for staff evaluation as vice principal in another district said:

> The system used now is very positively oriented. It is fine and great and glorious but it is not realistic. It doesn't give you anything to grow and improve. I would like to get constructive criticism. [In another district] I was responsible for evaluation. I know it is possible to give constructive criticism within the context of evaluation. I think evaluation should give more realistic incentives, both positive and negative.

The evaluation system's stress on the positive from their perspective diminished both the utility and the credibility of the evaluation process. Similarly, other teachers commented that while they saw themselves as competent teachers, they know there were areas in which they could improve.

> This system assumes that if you identify the good, teachers will keep doing it. And if you ignore the negative, it will go away. Administrators are afraid to focus on the negative because they worry about teachers having a poor self-image and so on.

Teachers believe that a part of the problem lies in the focus of the principal's clinical supervision training--to accentuate the positive. A number of teachers commented that principals needed training in giving negative feedback as well.

Both principals and teachers recognize that another part of the problem lies in the mandated structure of the teacher evaluation process. The same observation and reporting requirements obtain for all teachers, regardless of their level of experience or recognized competence. As a result, principals do not have the time to provide the constructive criticism that competent teachers would like. Often, the result is pro forma evaluation. One of the district's strongest principals admitted candidly:

> I have to evaluate too many people. Four or five people are taking all of my attention and I am just doing lip service for the rest. There is no way to fit all of this in within the present system and state constraints. So I just go through the motions with half of them.

Nor does the evaluation system reward excellence. Not surprisingly, a number of teachers in this school believe the present evaluation system is a waste of time.

Dissatisfaction about the present system also focuses on the weak end of the teacher competence scale. Teachers voiced surprisingly consistent and strong opinion that the system was too tolerant of incompetent classroom performance. For example, a teacher association building representative said: "This evaluation system is a joke. They don't use it to put people on probation enough." An association representative in another building echoed this view:

> I don't think the district is using this method to get poor teachers out. It is too hard to do under this system. Instead, administrators have to pressure them out in other ways.

Principals and central office personnel respond to these criticisms by pointing out the number of teachers that have been counseled out as evidence that the system is weeding out incompetent teachers. However, all participants acknowledge an important impediment to placing a teacher on probation--time.

The probationary procedures prescribed by state law consume considerable time. District practices require additional time: For example, principals must continually assess teacher response to their personal growth plan, conduct frequent observations, and meet at least once a week with the probationary teacher. One principal estimated that in the probationary period of February to May, he spends more than 55 hours with a probationary teacher.

This enormous investment of time is consistent with the district philosophy of doing everything possible to help a teacher get better. But it also means that, regardless of the actual teaching situation in a school, principals find it impossible to have more than one teacher on probation at a time. This is especially true at the elementary level, where no other administrative personnel share the burden. Principals, consequently, choose their probationary actions carefully.[15]

At least two principals raised an additional consideration to explain why all teachers who possibly should be were not on probation. That is, for some teachers, assessments of "unsatisfactory" or "needs improvement" would work against the improvement that they would hope to effect in classroom performance. For teachers expected to respond negatively to a probationary approach, but who are thought capable of substantial improvement, principals sometimes will assign a "satisfactory" rating and work in other ways to improve teacher performance. As one very effective principal (who has counseled out many teachers in the past four years) put it: "When you give someone a horrible rating, sometimes they bristle and fight back. When they do that, it is impossible to help them or work with them."

Finally, many teachers commented that the formality and rigidity of the specified process prevented principals from truly knowing "what's going on."[16] For one, a number of teachers noted that the prespecified

---

[15]A number of principals were quite frank in saying that instead of probation, transfer was a solution to the problem of ineffective teachers. However, this response will not be available much longer. A teacher building representative commented: "The dance of the lemons is slowing down now that the district is not growing as fast. It used to be easier to rotate teachers than go through a probation period. This cannot happen much any more. Now administrators will have to confront this."

[16]The teacher organization contract negotiated since our fieldwork

observation times allowed teachers to orchestrate a show-and-tell for evaluators. For example, one teacher said:

> There is a teacher in this school who only teaches two lessons a year--on the days he is being evaluated. Normally, he does nothing besides drink coffee and read the paper. I resent the fact that bums like him get the same rating I do. There is no room for excellence and it is hard to nail incompetence.

The vast majority of teachers whom we interviewed wanted more informal drop-in visits--"so the principal can get a real picture of what is going on." (Interestingly, this recommendation came from teachers on mandatory assistance, as well as from those acknowledged to be excellent.)

While the number of teachers counseled out, or put on probation or a mandatory assistance plan, belie the assertion that "it is almost impossible to catch a teacher who really has a problem," it is also true that this system of evaluation will "catch" some problems more readily than others. In particular, classroom management problems are difficult to hide even on a prearranged observation day (even though students are likely to be better behaved under the eyes of their principal). Gross ineffectiveness in communication also is hard to disguise.

The Lake Washington system, however, is not geared at all to assessing subject area competence or the ongoing quality of classroom activities as part of teacher evaluation activities. The system focuses on the process of teaching rather than instructional content.

LESSONS FROM LAKE WASHINGTON

Lake Washington's teacher evaluation system is working in the sense that it is taken seriously, is implemented relatively evenly throughout the district, has provided the information and structure to counsel out approximately 5 percent of the district's teachers, and is seen by many teachers as providing feedback that can improve their classroom practices. Teacher evaluation practices in Lake Washington describe some important lessons for the field.

---

took place responds to this point by expressly permitting unannounced principal visits.

Strategic Consistency

It is difficult to isolate the effects of Lake Washington's teacher evaluation system because it is an integral part of a management approach that includes staff development, program evaluation, and planning. District policies have a high level of strategic consistency--common goals, expectations, and processes. Because of their strategic interrelationship, the separate functions are significantly strengthened and teacher evaluation has become a central part of a principal's responsibilities, rather than a categorical or ancillary activity. Teacher evaluation is not just another administrator responsibility. This centrality seems critical to an effective teacher evaluation system.

Common Language

Lake Washington shows the substantial contribution that a common language between principals and teachers can make. Judith Little reached a similar conclusion in her study of school success and staff development:

> Teachers build up a shared language adequate to the complexity of teaching, capable of distinguishing one practice and its virtues from another, and capable of integrating large bodies of practice into distinct and sensible perspectives on the business of teaching. Other things being equal, the utility of collegial work . . . is a direct function of the concreteness, precision, and coherence of the shared language. . . . [Only administrator observation of classroom practices] and feedback can provide shared *referents* for the shared language of teaching, and both demand and provide the precision and concreteness which makes talk about teaching useful.[17]

The common ITIP training and resultant shared language is critical in order for principals to communicate their observations and assessments. Teacher evaluation thus can provide concrete direction for improvement.

---

[17]Judith Little, *School Success and Staff Development: The Roles of Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools*, The Center for Action Research, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, 1981, pp. 102-103. (Emphasis in original.)

Clinical Supervision Skills

The utility of common language depends in large part on administrator skill in clinical supervision. Reavis defines clinical supervision as "a process that aims at helping the teacher identify and clarify problems, receive data through the supervisor . . . and develop solutions with the aid of the supervisor."[18] Lake Washington principals receive extensive training in clinical supervision as part of their ITIP staff development sessions. In addition, the August workshops continue to emphasize evaluator skills. This training allows principals to observe with a high level of expertise concerning classroom processes and provides very specific, diagnostic feedback to teachers.

Top-Level Leadership and Commitment

Lake Washington shows clearly the importance of strong administrative commitment to evaluation and insistence that it be done right. Without that commitment and insistence, evaluation likely will be eclipsed by other more apparently urgent (or appealing) responsibilities and demands. As the situation in Lake Washington before and after Scarr's arrival suggests, meaningful teacher evaluation will occur only when district leadership insists on it, checks on it, and assigns resources to make it work.

Process, Not Form

The situation in Lake Washington before and after Scarr's arrival also shows that the present debate over the various forms and instruments for teacher evaluation may be misplaced. The system currently working in Lake Washington is formally the same system that did not work before Scarr arrived. The difference is *how* it is done (administrator skills, resources tied to evaluation, common language) not so much *what* is done. To this point, Hager, the deputy superintendent, notes that district principals are sufficiently well trained as to need only a blank piece of paper to do a good teacher evaluation.

---

[18] C. A. Reavis, *Teacher Improvement Through Clinical Supervision*, Phi Delta Kappan, Bloomington, Indiana, 1978.

A Highly Specified System Is Constraining

Most if not all of the weaknesses perceived in Lake Washington teacher evaluation stem not from district actions but from state-level requirements. The state specifically prescribes the frequency and extent of teacher evaluation. While this state-level specification may ensure minimally acceptable evaluation in districts with little commitment to the activity, in Lake Washington these state requirements prevent district administrators from devising a more productive evaluation strategy.

Most specifically, district teachers and administrators believe that teacher evaluation practices should be differentiated to reflect teacher skill and needs. Not all teachers need to be minimally evaluated for the same amount of time every year, as the state requires. The result of this procedural uniformity is pro forma evaluations in many cases, lack of special attention to excellence, and administrator inability to target evaluation resources.

Improvement and Personnel Decisions Can Both Be Served

Controversy over the multiple purposes of teacher evaluation--namely, staff improvement and personnel decisions--and their compatibility characterizes debate on teacher evaluation. The prevailing view appears to be that these two broad purposes are incompatible and that the same teacher evaluation system cannot address both. For example, one analysis of the field states: "The same system cannot constructively and simultaneously serve the needs of those interested in promoting teacher development and those responsible for personnel decisions."[19]

The Lake Washington experience suggests that this is not necessarily so. This district's experience indicates that both purposes can be served *if* there is a good relationship between district administrators and the teacher's union, and *if* evaluators are seen as consistent and fair.

---

[19]R. J. Stiggens and N. J. Bridgeford, *Performance Assessment for Teacher Development*, Center for Performance Assessment, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon, September 1982, p. 15.

Teacher perception of evaluator fairness and consistency is generally well-established in Lake Washington. The ongoing training provided to administrators has made the Lake Washington system essentially free of individual evaluator bias, even across classrooms. The exceptions to this general statement appear to be administrators whose personal style has alienated teachers and who are seen as relatively graceless evaluators. With these few exceptions, teachers see the process as equitable. To this point, union representatives comment that "If an administrator uses the procedure correctly, we are not going to be against them."

Scarr has worked hard at establishing a cooperative relationship with the Lake Washington Education Association. For example, he and his deputy superintendent meet with teacher association leaders to iron out foreseeable differences *before* contracts are negotiated. In addition, Scarr and Hager meet with the teacher organization executive every two weeks throughout the year to discuss mutual problems and concerns. In the face of a general state freeze on teachers' salaries, Scarr found a way to give Lake Washington teachers a raise. Union leaders said that the superintendent and the union have "a very open, very good working relationship. There is mutual trust and mutual goals." Some teachers do not share this view and, in fact, believe that Scarr has co-opted union leadership and is "trying to undermine the association." With his demands for staff development, accountability, and attendance at in-service courses, Scarr has alienated many teachers. A number commented that "Scarr's human relations skills are zero" and that the pressure concomitant with the superintendent's management approach has exhausted teachers. "There is a real morale problem in the district. There is too much pressure and it is filtering down to the teachers. Scarr is running the school system like a business and forgetting about people."

At the same time, these same teachers are proud of the professionalism associated with Lake Washington and none would want to teach in another district. Even in light of divergent opinion about the superintendent (one respondent remarked: "The farther you are away from the central office, the harder it is to like him"), no one denies that

Scarr is responsible for a substantial upswing in the quality of the district educational services. Strong teacher evaluation is a central part of his plan.

Appendix A

LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 414

EVALUATION OF CERTIFICATED TEACHERS

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA CHECKLIST

Preobservation Conference Date _____

Teacher Objective

Observation Date _____	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	COMMENTS
Criterion 1. Instructional Skill				
1.1 Plans instruction				
1.1.1 Identifies the learning needs				
1.1.2 Teaches the curriculum				
1.1.3 Develops plans				
1.2 Implements the planned objectives/experiences				
1.2.1 Gives clear instruction				
1.2.2 Assist student to develop work habits and study skills				
1.2.3 Gives assistance				
Criterion 2. Classroom Management				
2.1 Develop classroom procedures				
2.2 Organizes the physical setting				
2.3 Prepares materials				
2.4 Exercises care for physical safety and mental health of students				

	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	COMMENTS
2.5 Maintains records appropriate to level/subject				
2.6 Maintains records as required by law, District and building				
2.7 Organizes individual small group, or large group learning experiences				
Criterion 3. The Handling of Student Discipline and Attendant Problems				
3.1 Follows disciplinary procedures				
3.2 Encourages self-discipline				
3.3 Recognizes conditions, develops and implements strategies				
3.4 Makes known to student clear parameters for pupil conduct				
3.5 Deals consistently and fairly with student(s)				
3.6 Enlists assistance				
Criterion 4. Interest in Teaching Pupils				
4.1 Develops rapport with students				
4.2 Recognizes the unique characteristics of each student				
4.3 Guides learning				

	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	COMMENTS
Criterion 5. Effort Toward Improvement When Needed				
5.1 Continually assesses self				
5.2 Acknowledges recommendations				
Criterion 6. Knowledge of Subject Matter				
6.1 Keeps abreast of new developments and ideas				
6.2 Relates subject matter to general body of knowledge				
Criterion 7. Professional Preparation and Scholarship				
7.1 Possesses and maintains academic background				

Signature of Evaluator	Date	Signature of Person Being Evaluated	Date

(Both signatures are required. Signing of this instrument acknowledges participation in, but not necessarily concurrence with, evaluation conference.)

Provide a copy of this report to the employee.

SUMMARY EVALUATION REPORT

Classroom Teacher

Type of Evaluation

School Year 19__ - 19__

NAME _____ ____ Annual

SCHOOL _____ ____ 90-Day

TEACHING ASSIGNMENT _____ ____ Other
(If less than full time specify)

It is my judgment, based upon adopted criteria, that this teacher's overall performance has been _____ during the evaluation period covered by this report.
(satisfactory or unsatisfactory)

This evaluation is based in whole or in part upon observations for the purpose of evaluation which occurred on the dates as follows:

Pre-Conference Date	Observation Date	Post-Conference Date
__/__/__	__/__/__	__/__/__
__/__/__	__/__/__	__/__/__
__/__/__	__/__/__	__/__/__

CRITERIA (Refer to list of evaluation criteria and indicators)	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT (Comments)
Instructional Skill				
Classroom Management				
The Handling of Student Discipline and Attendant Problems				
Interest in Teaching Pupils				
Effort Toward Improvement When Needed				
Knowledge of Subject Matter				
Professional Preparation and Scholarship				
Additional Comments				

_____ _____ _____ _____
Immediate Supervisor Date Teacher's Signature Date

(Both signatures are required. Signing of this instrument acknowledges participation in, but not necessarily concurrence with, evaluation conference.)

Distribute as follows: 1. Person Being Evaluated -White
2. Unit Administrator -Yellow
3. Administrator for Personnel -Pink

Appendix B

LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 414

Dr. L. E. Scarr
Superintendent
Lake Washington School District No. 414
P.O. Box 619
Kirkland, WA 98033

Dear Dr. Scarr:

This letter constitutes a recommendation to put Mr/Ms Jane/John Doe on probation beginning Wednesday, February 1, 1978. I have made this decision after many months of thought and hard work. I feel that such a recommendation is necessary at this time.

Enclosed you will find a copy of the summary evaluation report, a reasonable set of expectations and a program designed to assist Mr/Ms Doe to improve his/her performance. It is my desire that Mr/Ms Doe will demonstrate a marked improvement in those areas designated as problems and I will assist him/her in any way possible during the probationary period.

If there are any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Principal

Classroom Teacher

Type of Evaluation

School Year 1977 - 1978

NAME John/Jane Doe ____ Annual

SCHOOL _____ ____ 90-Day

TEACHING ASSIGNMENT Math (If less than full time specify) x Other

It is my judgment, based upon adopted criteria, that this teacher's overall performance has been unsatisfactory (satisfactory or unsatisfactory) during the evaluation period covered by this report.

This evaluation is based in whole or in part upon observations for the purpose of evaluation which occurred on the dates as follows:

Pre-Conference Date	Observation Date	Post-Conference Date
9/ 21/ 77	9/ 21/ 77	9/ 23/ 77
9/ 27/ 77	9/ 27/ 77	9/ 30/ 77
10/ 6/ 77	10/ 6/ 77	10/ 6/ 77
11/ 18/ 77	11/ 18/ 77	11/ 18/ 77
1/ 10/ 78	1/ 10/ 78	1/ 10/ 78

CRITERIA (Refer to list of evaluation criteria and indicators)	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory	STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT (Comments)
Instructional Skill			X	See attached sheet
Classroom Management			X	See attached sheet
The Handling of Student Discipline and Attendant Problems			X	See attached sheet
Interest in Teaching Pupils	X			
Effort Toward Improvement When Needed			X	See attached sheet
Knowledge of Subject Matter	X			
Professional Preparation and Scholarship	X			

Additional Comments

	1/16/78		1/16/78
Immediate Supervisor	Date	Teacher's Signature	Date

(Both signatures are required. Signing of this instrument acknowledges participation in, but not necessarily concurrence with, evaluation conference.)

Distribute as follows: 1. Person Being Evaluated -White
2. Unit Administrator -Yellow
3. Administrator for Personnel -Pink

Instruction Skill

Mr/Ms Doe shows deficiencies in the following areas:

1. Mr/Ms Doe presents material to students that is inappropriate for their ability.

2. Lessons are poorly organized. Objectives are not clearly stated. Assignments are changed after students start to work.

3. Mr/Ms Doe presentations are not understood by the students. The directions are stated in such a way that they are difficult to understand. Often instructions are unrelated to the lesson.

4. Mr/Ms Doe is unable to control loud talking, squealing, yelling so that students who want to work can.

I have met with Mr/Ms Doe at least six times since September 1977 and in these meetings I have given him/her specific suggestions as to how he/she might improve instructions. I suggested writing out instructions, bringing them in and practicing giving them to me or the vice principal. I suggested putting the different groups in rows so that students would know who is being taught. I suggested to Mr/Ms Doe to stop once in a while and ask students if they understood what was being said and follow that up by asking specific students to repeat in their own words the instructions that were given.

I suggested different grouping patterns and that he/she work with the department head for specific ways to handle the record keeping for the groups. I suggested that he/she might have some work on the board or dittos for students to start when they came in the room. This could be the review work and he/she could walk around the room and find out quickly where each student was and then proceed accordingly so that the students were working at the right level of their ability.

Although there is progress for short periods of time, Mr/Ms Doe reverts back to his/her old patterns of confusing assignments and confusing lessons. Mr/Ms Doe has made little or no progress in this area.

Classroom Management

Mr/Ms Doe has had much difficulty in the management of his/her classes. He/she assigns specific seats to students but does not follow through to insist that students remain in them. He/she is unable to control students who are noisy, disrespectful, and argumentative. The noise level is such that students ask to be moved from his/her room, and parents request the removal of their students from his/her classes. He/she sets up rules to be followed and when no one follows them he/she writes new ones instead of insisting that the agreed upon procedures are implemented. The students are confused and do not know what the procedures and/or rules are.

In two other situations, Mr/Ms Doe had called students at home. In one case it was 7:00 p.m. Sunday evening and after fifteen minutes of telling the student he was failing he/she found he/she had the wrong student. Instead of stopping and apologizing to the student, he/she continued on telling him he was not doing all that well either.

In another situation he/she called a seventh grade student at 9:15, getting him upset for not turning in assignments. He/she kept this student on the phone until 9:40. The reason the student had not turned in his assignments was he did not know which group he was in or what assignments were his responsibility.

In both situations, I informed Mr/Ms Doe both verbally and in writing that he/she was not to call students at home.

I have attempted to work with Mr/Ms Doe by giving him/her material to read on management skills. I have given him/her specific suggestions to follow, like separating noisy students, changing seating patterns, etc. without any appreciable change on his/her part. In the past, I have gone into his/her classes and demonstrated for him/her the teaching of how rules are set up and how to get students to follow them. There is little or no carryover. About a week after the lesson is taught Mr/Ms Doe reverts back to his/her unsatisfactory ways of working with students.

Handling of Student Discipline

Mr/Ms Doe shows the following in deficiencies in this area:

1. Does not control the class within the normal limits of behavior. Examples of misconduct observed or reported include:

    a) Students throwing paper, paper clips, rubber bands, seeds, etc. at the teacher. Setting off firecrackers and stink bombs in class.

    b) Continual loud talking by students, students yelling at each other, students not paying attention to the teacher, students calling out answers.

    c) Students out of seats, climbing over desks, walking in and out of the room without permission, running and wrestling in the classroom.

In most conference I have pointed out one or more types of behavior mentioned above. I have sent him/her to workshops on discipline. I sent him/her to I.T.I.P. this summer at Seattle Pacific University. I have given him/her books on discipline. The counselors, vice principal, and I have attempted to assist Mr/Ms Doe in his/her classroom control even to the extent of doing demonstration lessons.

Ms/Ms Doe's comments are, "that's great, I will try it." He/she tries it for a short period of time and then it's back to the same routine. Much progress by Mr/Ms Doe must be made in this area.

Efforts Toward Improvement

During this first four months of the 1977-78 school year, the vice principal, counselors, department head and I have made specific suggestions to Mr/Ms Doe to improve his/her instruction. In most instances Mr/Ms Doe does not proceed as prescribed and reverts back to his/her way of doing things. In most conferences, Mr/Ms Doe insists he/she is doing a good job and I am merely harassing him/her. He/she does not assess him/herself realistically.

Expectations

During the probationary period Mr/Ms Doe will be observed twice each month in accordance with the agreement with the Lake Washington Education Association. During these observations:

1. Mr/Ms Doe will demonstrate his/her ability to

   a) give clear, concise instructions to students

   b) write lesson plans in such a manner that they will be acceptable to the building principal

   c) be consistent with students

   d) communicate effectively with students.

2. Mr/Ms Doe will demonstrate his/her ability to

   a) work with students and construct some classroom procedures that are acceptable to the students and principal

   b) assign students to a specific seat and they will remain in those seats during the class period.

3. Ms/Ms Doe will demonstrate his/her ability to

   a) have students follow disciplinary procedures that are not circumvented or ignored

   b) have the class demonstrate acceptable classroom behavior as interpreted by the building administrator. Indicators of unacceptable behavior shall include but not be limited to

      (1) students getting out of their seats without permission

      (2) students throwing any articles in the classroom

      (3) loud talking, yelling, setting off of firecrackers, stink bombs

      (4) students arguing with the teacher

      (5) running, pushing, shoving or fighting in class

      (6) leaving class without written permission.

4. Ms/Ms Doe will demonstrate his/her ability to

   a) analyze learning and/or other difficulties through oral monitoring of the instructional group

b) give instructions step-by-step and stopping to ask students if they understand, and have them repeat back the instructions

c) Mr/Ms Doe will have short (7 - 10 problems) assignments on the board or as handouts at the beginning of each class. These are to be done by students immediately and Mr/Ms Doe is to check this work before class is ended.

5. Mr/Ms Doe will demonstrate his/her ability to give clear, concise instructions by making a practice presentation to the building administrator once each week.

Program for Improvement

The program for improvement has already been started as a result of the 1976-77 evaluations and the observations made this year.

1. My observations and suggestions for improvement and my expectations.

2. Sending Mr/Ms Doe to the I.T.I.P. workshop this summer at Seattle Pacific University.

3. The sending of Mr/Ms Doe to a workshop on classroom management this fall.

During the probationary period, for the purpose of improvement, Mr/Ms Doe will:

1. Meet with me after each observation and get feedback to his/her performance and receive suggestions for improvement in relation to

   a) areas designated as areas that need to be improved

   b) general suggestions concerning the total teaching act.

2. Read the book, Teacher Effectiveness Training, paying special attention to chapters III, IV, and V, and the books by Madeline Hunter, Motivation, Teach More Faster and Reinforcement.

3. Hand in lesson plans for the week each Monday prior to school.

4. Each Tuesday after school is dismissed, Mr/Ms Doe is to come to my office and practice giving directions for some of the assignments that he/she will be giving in her classes the following day.

5. Do a video taping of Mr/Ms Doe so he/she will have a visual idea of some of the problem areas.

6. Second observer (Director of Secondary Education) will observe and meet with Mr/Ms Doe after observing. One observation will be a drop in visit, any other will be scheduled.

7. Mr/Ms Doe will observe three other math teachers outside of his/her building to observe and discuss; class control, giving directions, and teaching at the proper level of the students. The schedule of these observations will be set up by the building administrator.

8. A mock teaching episode will be set up by the building administrator for the purpose of helping Mr/Ms Doe to see some alternative ways to deal with specific kinds of disciplinary problems.

9. If a course in classroom control and/or teacher effectiveness is offered, Mr/Ms Doe will be given the opportunity to attend.

I believe if Mr/Ms Doe follows the prescribed program as suggested and it becomes a permanent part of his/her teaching, he/she can become an effective teacher in the Lake Washington School District.

LAKE WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 414

Mr./Ms. Jane/John Doe
1234 Main Street
Kirkland, WA 98033

Dear Mr/Ms Doe:

As superintendent of the Lake Washington School District, acting upon the professional judgment and advice of your building principal, and upon the review of district policies and practices, and statutes pertaining, it is my responsibility to inform you that I have determined that there is sufficient cause to place you on probation for the period beginning February 1, 1978, and extending to a date no later than May 1, 1978.

The action to place you on probation is taken pursuant to RCW 28A.67.065. The reason for this action is that your work has been judged to be unsatisfactory based upon the school district's evaluation criteria. The specific areas of your performance deficiencies are as follows:

1. In the area of Instructional Skill you have not adequately provided for the individual needs of your students.

    a) You have placed students at a rate that is inappropriate to their ability level. For example, on September 21, 1977, you gave the class a quiz on the subtraction facts. Upon completion of the quiz and the correction of the problems, the students indicated by raising their hands that 90-95% of the students understood the concept and had all the problems correct. Instead of moving on to the next more difficult step in the subtraction process, you gave more drill on subtraction facts.

    b) Your planning is poorly organized and objectives unclear as to what you want students to learn. An example of this was the lesson you did on November 18, 1977, involving factoring and the factoring tree. You took approximately 20 minutes explaining to all students how the factoring tree worked. You then switched to another group and began to work with factoring using the short division method. The students in both groups were confused as to which method they were to use and they were also confused on how to do factoring using either method.

c) You have failed to provide students with clear, concise instruction and have failed to communicate effectively with students. An example of your failure to communicate effectively with students took place on November 2, 1977, during your second period class. A student came to your desk to get his assignment. You sent him back to his seat and told him to do a particular page in the book and you also gave him a pen with red ink to do his work. When the student questioned you why he could not use his pencil, you sent him to the office for not being cooperative and refusing to do his work.

d) You have allowed an atmosphere to persist in your classes that tends to lead to poor study habits. When students are supposed to be working you allow loud talking by students, students getting out of their seats, persons calling out answers, students throwing paper, making it very difficult for students to complete their assigned assignments.

2. You have not adequately managed your room so that students follow prescribed procedures or rules. For example, in your first set of rules issued to students:

Rule 6 - Do not throw anything.
Rule 13 - No running in class.
Rule 15 - Do not interrupt teacher when she is talking.
Rule 20 - No screaming across room.
Rule 21 - No cheating - do your assignments.

Yet during the principal's observations on September 21, September 27, October 6, October 18, and November 2, all of the above rules were either circumvented or ignored.

a) You have failed to maintain the physical setting so that effective learning can take place. The noise level is at such an intensity that students leave the room to go to the library to work or to the office conference room because they cannot work in your class due to the disruptions.

b) You have not exercised care for the physical setting because of the throwing of objects, interruptions by students, and the arguing of the teacher with students.

3. You have not adequately handled student discipline and attendant problems. Some examples of observed and reported student misconduct are as follows:

a) Students throwing paper, paper clips, rubber bands, seeds, books, pencils at the teacher and at other students.

b) Continual loud talking by students, students yelling at each other, students not listening, calling out answers when they are not called upon.

c) Students out of their seats without permission and engaging in disruptive conduct such as climbing over desks, going in and out of the room without permission, wrestling in class, kicking a hole in the wall, setting off firecrackers and stink bombs in class.

4. You have not adequately made the effort toward improvement when needed.

a) You have not followed through on the suggestions that have been given to you in areas of rules, seating arrangements, writing out the directions.

The purpose for the establishment of the probationary period is to give you the opportunity to demonstrate improvement in your areas of deficiency. In this connection the following set of expectations is provided to assist you in understanding what level of performance will constitute acceptable performance in your area of deficiency.

1. Instructional Skill and Planning:

a) Demonstrate the ability to give clear, concise instructions to the students by way of writing the instructions out in advance exactly as you will give them to the students. You should check the comprehension of the directions given, by asking students to repeat the directions back to you in their own words. You should plan to meet with your building principal each Tuesday after school and practice giving these directions.

b) Demonstrate the ability to analyze learning through oral monitoring of selected students to determine whether the concepts being taught are understood, plus giving written examinations to determine the strengths and weaknesses of students, and whether the material you are presenting is at the appropriate level for the learner.

c) Demonstrate the ability to give assignments to students without confusing them or changing the assignment once they have started. The different groups in the class will be placed in the same row or rows to lessen the confusion of direction giving.

d) Demonstrate the ability to write lesson plans properly and so that they are easily understood through writing your objectives in behavioral terms and a step-by-step procedure on how you will achieve those objectives.

2. Classroom Management:

Classroom management must be achieved.

a) The unacceptable practice of students not sitting in the assigned seats must be eliminated. This should be accomplished by assigning students to a specific seat and following through by insisting students remain in them.

b) The students shall be made aware of what is expected of them. In this connection a set of classroom procedures will be made up for each class. These procedures must also be acceptable to the building principal and each student will be given a copy of these procedures, to be taken home, signed by parent or guardian, and then placed in a student folder.

c) You will not call students at home unless you have obtained prior approval of your building principal, otherwise contacts with students will take place during the school day.

3. Student Discipline and Attendant Problems:

Student management of time and behavior must be achieved.

a) The acceptable noise level in your classes must be reduced by:

(1) students must raise hands and be called upon by teacher before talking

(2) students must have permission to get out of their seats

(3) students will not be allowed to leave the class without written permission

(4) students will not be permitted to participate in disruptive behavior such as running in the classroom, climbing over desks, throwing any objects, setting off firecrackers or stink bombs in class.

4. Effort Toward Improvement:

Demonstrate the ability to follow through on suggestions and recommendations for improvement. This follow through means to continue using the suggestions until it is mutually agreed upon by the building principal and yourself that a different method should be tried.

The following program for assistance is established to help you overcome your performance deficiencies:

1. Meet with your building principal after each observation to receive feedback on your performance level and receive additional suggestions for improvement.

2. Read the book, Teacher Effectiveness Training, giving special attention to chapters III, IV, and V, and the books by Madeline Hunter, Motivation, Teach More Faster and Reinforcement.

3. Hand in lesson plans to your principal once each week for the week on Monday prior to school. These lesson plans should have the objective for each lesson and step-by-step procedure on how these objectives will be achieved.

4. Each Tuesday after school is dismissed, time will be set aside by your building principal so that you will have the opportunity to practice a mock teaching situation to practice giving directions for some of your assignments.

5. Arrangements will be made to videotape one or more of your classes to gain greater insight concerning the problems you are having.

6. In addition to your principal, a second observer (Director, Secondary Education) will observe a minimum of two (2) of your classes. He will meet with you to offer suggestions for improvement. At least one observation will be scheduled and at least one will be a drop in visit.

7. Your principal will make arrangements for you to observe three other math teachers outside your building. You will be given the opportunity to discuss discipline techniques, giving directions, and teaching at the proper level of the students.

8. Your principal will arrange to have mock teaching episodes set up in the building so that you can get some help on how to handle specific types of disciplinary problems.

9. If within the probationary period, courses in class control, classroom management, or teacher effectiveness are offered you will be given the opportunity to attend.

Your building principal will work closely with you during the probationary period and will assist in the development of such additional procedures as may be appropriate to help you overcome the above deficiencies.

If you have any alternative solutions to this program for improvement, please submit them to your building principal in writing so they might be evaluated.

Mr/Ms Doe, your probation becomes effective on February 1, 1978, and will extend to a date no longer than May 1, 1978. Should you during the course of your probation, demonstrate improvement to the satisfaction of your building principal, you will be removed from probation. Improvement must be made in the areas of deficiencies described in this letter and the improvement program prescribed herein. If satisfactory improvement is not so demonstrated during the probationary period, nonrenewal of your contract will be considered.

I trust that you will make every effort to work cooperatively with your supervisor to successfully accomplish the improvements in areas of concern described in this letter.

Sincerely,

L. E. Scarr
Superintendent

III. THE GREENWICH (CONNECTICUT) PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

Arthur E. Wise

REASONS FOR THE SELECTION OF GREENWICH

Greenwich, Connecticut, is a wealthy suburban school district of 7500 students, populated largely by business managers and their families. Its performance-goal approach to school management and to teacher evaluation reflects a managerial orientation toward the provision of incentives in support of district goals. Operationally, this means that, while centrally determined goals are used for school management decisions, the goals by which teachers are evaluated are not necessarily predetermined system goals.

Each year, in consultation with the principal or teacher leader (a teacher with part-time administrative status), teachers set their own individual goals, plans for achieving the goals, and means for measuring whether the goals have been accomplished. Although system goals may be chosen, the evaluation process is intended to foster "individual improvement," and its design allows for individualized definitions of growth and development.

The Greenwich evaluation process includes at least one observation and three conferences between the evaluator and teacher each year. Teachers complete a self-evaluation report, and evaluators complete an open-ended evaluation report which may be based on both the specific annual goals and on general teaching guidelines included in the collective bargaining agreement.

Evaluation may result in a teacher's being placed on "marginal status," but this rarely occurs in Greenwich. Perhaps because of the evaluation process, and perhaps because of the nature of the district's teaching force (which is highly experienced and highly educated), negative personnel decisions based on evaluation results almost never take place.

Given its individualized nature, the test of the Greenwich approach is whether teachers say that it helps them improve their teaching. In recent surveys conducted by the district, about half of them said that it did.

Because the evaluation process is carefully conducted, it forces regularized, teacher-specific interaction between principals and teachers and provides a focus for and recognition of teachers' efforts. Based on a motivational theory of management, the approach tries to strke a balance between individual stages of development and system goals. Whether the process will be adaptable to the personnel decisions that may soon be required in this declining enrollment district remains to be seen.

THE POLICY CONTEXT

Greenwich is an upper-income suburb of New York City; it has a population of 60,000. The school system has nine elementary schools (K through 6), three junior high schools (7 through 9), and one high school (divided into four "houses"). Enrollment is about 7500; the expenditure per pupil is $3500, substantially above the Connecticut average. The professional staff numbers about 632; the average class size is about 22. The teaching staff averages 41.6 years of age and 12 years of experience; 87.6 percent have at least a master's degree. Approximately 25 percent of the residents of school age attend nonpublic schools. Recently, the percentage of private school attendance has risen slightly.

In 1982, 74 percent of Greenwich High School graduates planned to continue their formal education beyond high school; 64 percent of the college-bound graduates planned to attend four-year colleges. Twelve percent were planning to attend institutions ranked "most-competitive" by Barron's *Profiles of American Colleges*. The SAT scores of the college-bound exceeded the Connecticut and national averages. Test-score performance and attendance at selective colleges are important for many, if not most, Greenwich families, yet a substantial minority of Greenwich students are not bound for college. In a recent *Money* magazine survey, Greenwich High School was chosen one of the 12 best in the country.

Greenwich enrollment is declining as a result of the same demographic trends affecting the rest of the nation. The decline in Greenwich is likely to continue because of the high cost of housing, the slow rate of construction, and the aging of the town.

Perhaps because Greenwich is home for many corporate officials, the school system is influenced by a management ethic. In fact, the Greenwich school district management system operates with the following five distinct components related to *management-by-objectives* (MBO).

1. The Board of Education's annual *Goals and Priorities for Improving the Greenwich Public Schools*, the establishment of which sets in motion an accountability process for the superintendent, the effects of which are felt throughout the system.
2. The *School Assessment Document*, which forms the basis for the assessment of the principal and the school. The principal is required to (a) describe his or her approach to the board's priorities; (b) describe program/team goals, action plans, and evaluation plans; (c) describe his or her own goals and goals for other administrators in the school; (d) provide an annual report of accomplishments; (e) rate each program in the school; (f) report on students performing above and below level; and (g) list all outstanding and all marginal staff members.
3. *A Performance Goal Approach*, the teacher evaluation procedure.
4. The system-wide, criterion-referenced testing system, which is administered in some grades and some programs.
5. The school-based program team, made up of representatives of the community, faculty, administration, and students (in the case of secondary schools).

The first four components--the board goals and three management systems--obviously push in the direction of uniformity throughout the system. The fifth, however, is a countervailing management system, the function of which is to help the principal manage the school. The program team nevertheless is expected to pay attention to board goals and, in fact, contributes to the selection of board goals.

Over the last four or five years, the Greenwich management style has shifted from relative decentralization with substantial discretion for principals and teachers to greater centralization. In this, Greenwich is following the national trend; school systems have been centralizing control through the use of management tools. Greenwich, as noted, is a town populated largely by managers. Thus, one might expect the national trend to be reinforced.

Locally, school system personnel attribute the impetus for centralization to the board. They perceive the board as "wanting to know what is going on everywhere . . . to see its goals and priorities implemented in all schools . . . and to have the same high-quality programs in all schools." These goals, of course, cause the central administration to institute control and data collection mechanisms. Individual teachers in Greenwich, it was noted, had been allowed to choose their own curriculum. This degree of teacher autonomy is no longer to be permitted.

The control and data-collection mechanisms include, as we have noted, the various management-by-objectives systems, including the teacher evaluation system, some system-wide criterion-referenced testing, centrally limited text selection, and the development of curriculum guides. All of these set in motion management routines that many teachers believe limits their professional autonomy.

We will consider in some detail how the Greenwich teacher evaluation system is being used to tighten control in the school system and how the teacher evaluation system is itself being more tightly controlled. The system was originally established to help individual teachers to improve their performance, as they, in consultation with their evaluators, perceived their own needs for improvement. Now the board and the administration hope to use the system for additional purposes.

The board and the administration want the teacher evaluation system to serve as a primary mechanism for the implementation of board goals. They also want teacher evaluation to yield sufficiently precise information that the system can be used to terminate the employment of teachers who perform poorly. Finally, they want the system to provide

information that could be used in a reduction-in-force so that RIFs could be based on criteria other than seniority.

THE TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM ON PAPER

The Process

The Greenwich teacher evaluation process has as its stated purpose the improvement of individual teacher performance. The primary mechanism is a goal-setting process wherein the teacher and his or her evaluator mutually develop goals, plans for their achievement, and means for their measurement. A second mechanism in the process is classroom observation by the evaluator. The evaluator assesses the extent to which goals are achieved and also evaluates the teacher according to the following *Guidelines for Professional Performance*:

GUIDELINES FOR PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

I. Professional Competence

A. Classroom Instruction

1. Shows the extent and quality of basic preparation
2. Exhibits knowledge which is current
3. Shows evidence of planning and good organization
4. Recognizes differences in capacities and interests of students
5. Uses instructional techniques that are current, resourceful, and challenging
6. Enriches the daily program through a variety of interests
7. Conducts class with poise and self-assurance
8. Makes a sound evaluation of each student using reliable tools of measurement
9. Conducts activities consistent with and supportive of the school system's philosophy

B. Human Relationships

1. Shows understanding, interest, and concern for students' emotional, social, and physical characteristics
2. Develops in students a respect for learning
3. Develops in students a consideration of the rights, feelings, and ideas of others
4. Achieves pupil control through wise and careful guidance
5. Works cooperatively with other staff members
6. Recognizes and respects individual differences among staff members

7. Communicates with parents
8. Interprets educational programs, procedures, and plans to the public
9. Shows an awareness of community activities
10. Respects the confidential nature of professional information
11. Recognizes the effect of personal appearance on the learning environment
12. Functions in a controlled and effective manner under pressure

II. Professional Attitudes

A. Growth

1. Avails self of opportunities to improve professionally
2. Keeps abreast of the professional literature and current methodology
3. Seeks assistance when needed
4. Accepts and uses constructive suggestions
5. Shares techniques and pertinent materials with other teachers
6. Recognizes strengths and limitations

B. Responsibilities

1. Accepts responsibilities
2. Knows and uses channels of authority
3. Meets obligations (promptly and thoroughly)
4. Speaks and writes clearly and accurately
5. Maintains, within reasonable limits, physical and mental health needed to meet professional responsibilities
6. Has mature understanding of own and others' problems
7. Seeks to understand different sides of a question
8. Seeks facts before reaching conclusions
9. Conducts self in an ethical manner

Self-evaluation of performance goals is also required. While the process was designed for individual performance improvement, its possible future use for personnel decisions in the face of pending tenured staff cutbacks looms large in the minds of teachers and administrators.

The teacher must have at least one performance goal per year, although more are encouraged. The goals are likely to be drawn from three sources. The first, the Greenwich *Guidelines for Professional Performance*, helps the teacher to set professional competence goals and professional attitude goals. The choice of a goal from the *Guidelines*

means that the teacher is attempting to develop himself or herself along one of the lines on which all teachers are to be observed and evaluated.

The second source of goals is the *Board of Education Goals and Priorities*. Each year the board establishes its goals and priorities. These become the board's charge to the superintendent. The list for 1982-1983 appears below. At year's end, the superintendent reports to the board on their attainment. Consequently, the school system and its teachers are expected to pay attention to them in the individual teacher's goal-setting process. The list for 1982-1983 follows:

BOARD OF EDUCATION GOALS AND PRIORITIES

Goal I Ensure that the educational, social, and emotional needs of students are identified and matched with appropriate experiences and environments.

A. Complete a program framework for the K-5, 6-8, 9-12 grade organization.

B. Continue to improve the early childhood programs including planning for full day kindergarten and before and after school activities.

C. Define common objectives and program structure for gifted and talented children and begin implementation.

D. Continue to implement selected health education objectives.

E. Review and act upon revised high school graduation requirements.

F. Increase students' understanding and use of the computer.

Goal II Increase the percentage of students who perform at their level of ability in reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies, and foreign language.

A. Continue to improve the quality of writing in grades K-12.

B. Begin social studies program improvements.

C. Continue to increase the percentage of students who are performing at their level of expectancy in reading, language arts, and mathematics.

D. Assess the quality of the elementary science program.

Goal III Broaden the arts experiences for all students.

A. Integrate the arts into the general curriculum of the elementary schools.

Goal IV Insure that the staff of the Greenwich schools is of high quality and is enabled to perform up to its full capacity.

A. Identify and assist those staff members who need to improve; reinforce those who are functioning at a high level; and provide support for those who need to seek other careers.

Goal V Insure that the physical condition of school buildings and grounds has a positive effect on learning and teaching.

A. Continue the rehabilitation of elementary and junior high schools.

B. Improve the maintenance program.

C. Continue improvements to make the schools energy-efficient.

Goal VI Ensure that students have the skills and information to make informed career decisions.

A. Continue to improve the training and placement of students who will be entering the employment market after high school.

Goal VII Increase understanding of the public schools and participation in their activities by residents who are not directly involved in the schools.

A. Expand communications with and participation in the schools by residents not directly involved in them.

The third source of goals is the individual school *program team goals*. The team establishes school goals; some of these implement the board goals; others are unique to the school. Teachers are, of course, encouraged to adopt these goals. While the performance goals of a teacher are to be his or her own, some pressure exists to have teachers adopt system and school goals.

The school assessment document, which is required of each principal on an annual basis, serves as a source of school goals. This report requires the principal to evaluate each program (e.g., mathematics) in his or her school, thus bringing attention to less-than-good programs. As a principal concentrates on upgrading a program, he or she may encourage teachers to adopt specific goals.

In the Greenwich system, the evaluation of teachers is considered central to the role of the principal. The system strives for an evaluator/teacher ratio of about one to twenty. Consequently, larger elementary schools have teacher leaders who are part-time teachers and part-time administrators who evaluate teachers. The junior and senior high schools have a number of administrators and differentiated staff (like teacher leaders) who assist the principal in evaluation.

Having chosen or accepted goals, the teacher must develop a plan for accomplishing them (i.e., an achievement plan), as well as criteria for measuring success. The formal teacher evaluation process (as written) provides little, if any, guidance concerning achievement plans. Concerning evaluation of the achievement plans, the *Cooperative Staff Evaluation* document specifies that goals be "measurable or observable." Forms to be completed at the end of the year require both evaluator and teacher to judge whether a goal and attendant achievement plan have been "fully accomplished," "almost accomplished," or "missed, need to recycle." The last judgment requires that the goal be repeated the following year.

The evaluator observes the teacher's classroom not only as an aid to determining whether goals have been accomplished but also to assess whether the *Guidelines for Professional Performance* are being met. Our interviews indicated that the "professional competence" categories of "classroom instruction" and "human relationships" are emphasized. The evaluator may visit a classroom informally any number of times but must observe formally at least once a year for not less than 20 minutes. The evaluator must complete a Supervision-Observation Form (see Fig. 1) and must have a conference with the teacher following the observation.

The evaluation process does not prescribe whether the teacher is to know when the evaluator is to observe; practices among evaluators vary with some allowing the teacher to decide whether he or she wishes to know. The observation form is quite general, leaving the evaluator free to exercise discretion over precisely what will be observed and commented on.

SUPERVISION-OBSERVATION FORM

Teacher _____ Observation Date _____

Grade and Subject _____ Beginning Time _____

School _____ Ending Time _____

Evaluator _____ Conference Date _____

1. Description of Observation	2. Summary Comments (When appropriate include suggestions for improvement).

3. Teacher Comments (optional)

Date _____ Teacher Received Copy _____
(Signature)

Date _____ Evaluator's Signature _____
(Signature)

White Copy - Personnel
Yellow Copy - Principal/Evaluator
Pink Copy - Asst. Supt./Director
Goldenrod Copy - Teacher

Fig. 1--Greenwich teacher supervision and observation form

At the end of the year, the evaluator completes a *Total Performance Report*, in which he or she assesses the teacher's effectiveness in relation to the *Guidelines*. The report may also include the goal-setting component, human relationships, committee work, and other responsibilities. The evaluator may draw upon information derived from both formal and informal observations.

Other formal features of the teacher evaluation process include special procedures for first-year teachers, marginal teachers, and athletic coaches. First-year teachers may exempt themselves from goal setting. Teachers who are having difficulty may be placed on marginal status. In such cases, an evaluator must perform eight formal observations and hold eight conferences with a teacher; a second evaluator must also become involved. Marginal status is given only in exceptional cases (less than 1 percent).

A committee of six administrators (appointed by the superintendent) and six teachers (appointed by the Greenwich Education Association) oversees the teacher evaluation process. The committee reviews the philosophy, instruments, and procedures on a continuous basis.

Connecticut enacted a teacher evaluation law in 1974, requiring an annual evaluation of all certified personnel (except the superintendent). The State Board of Education has issued guiding principles, the most important of which is "The primary purpose of teacher evaluation is the improvement of the student learning experience."

Greenwich, which began teacher evaluation before the 1974 state law, observes the law's principles, as well as the state board's eleven *Guidelines for Teacher Evaluation*, the most important of which is "Each professional shall cooperatively determine with the evaluator(s) the objectives upon which his or her evaluation shall be based." Whether the state set the tone for Greenwich or vice versa, we cannot say.

Greenwich's collective bargaining agreement contains the following provisions pertinent to teacher evaluation:

- Each teacher shall have at least one formal observation per year.
- No evaluation shall be the subject of a grievance, unless it is illegal, immaterial, or contains false information.
- Each formal evaluation shall be made and signed by an employee in a position which requires an administrative certificate.[1] Other certified professionals may have a supplemental role in the evaluation process. Upon request by a teacher, the administration shall designate an additional certified professional with expertise in the area being evaluated to have a supplemental role in the evaluation process.
- All evaluators shall be knowledgeable in the techniques and criteria to be used in the evaluation process. To this end, the board shall continue to provide funds, time, and supportive services necessary to apprise the evaluators of the techniques and criteria to be used in the evaluation process.
- Selection of tenured certified staff to be dismissed shall be made on the basis of the following: certification, general competence, instructional skills, skills considered vital to the needs of the system, and seniority.

This final provision, which has aroused particular controversy, allows the teacher evaluation procedure to come into play in decisions about staff cutbacks due to declining enrollment. The procedure has been used to terminate the employment of one senior tenured staff member.

Finally, the superintendent, in implementing the board of education goal concerning staff quality (Goal IV, above), now requires principals to identify outstanding teachers. The existing *Guidelines for Professional Performance* are used. He also has developed a statement of "skills considered vital to the needs of the system" to be used to ensure that, in a RIF, teachers with these skills will be retained.

---

[1]Teacher leaders who have evaluation responsibilities must have administrative certificates.

Differentiated Staff

Greenwich is distinguished by a system of differentiated staffing. Of a teaching staff of about 630, 91 are differentiated. Differentiation was instituted to provide opportunities for professional growth and for the demonstration of leadership capability. Furthermore, it reduces the span of control and increases instructional assistance without creating a larger permanent cadre of administrators. Differentiated staff remain part-time classroom teachers. A description of their roles and the number in each role follows.

- Teacher leader with district-wide responsibility for a program.

Four teacher leaders, including, for example, the one responsible for staff development, are in charge of district-wide programs. They do not evaluate teachers.

- School-based teacher leader.

Sixteen teacher leaders operate in the elementary and junior high schools. In the former, they function essentially as assistant principals; in the latter, as grade-level chairpersons. These teacher leaders evaluate teachers; this function appears to have been the major rationale for the creation of the role.

- Division chairpersons.

Five division chairpersons operate in the high school. They function as program-specific administrators at the building level. These division chairpersons evaluate teachers in their divisions (e.g., science, physical education). The size of the division, its location "out of house" and therefore out of the easy access of the housemaster who would otherwise be the evaluator, and the number of in-house evaluations for which a housemaster is responsible appear to be the major reasons for the creation of the role.

- Senior teachers.

Sixty-six teachers, designated as senior teachers, have administrative and program responsibilities. In the secondary schools, most of them function in their departments as department chairpersons or, at least, "first among equals." They do not evaluate teachers, but they do counsel and assist teachers in improving their performance.

Teachers who spend more than 20 percent of their time on administration are considered to be administrators. They cease to be members of the Greenwich Education Association (GEA). Differentiated staff roles are temporary (untenured), and GEA has said that it would not readmit differentiated staff if a RIF led to the elimination of their special positions. The GEA has not objected to the proliferation of differentiated staff, perhaps because these positions open new teaching positions.

The system distinguishes between teacher leaders, who generally teach half time, receive a $2000 stipend as administrators, and work ten extra days, and senior teachers, who generally teach four-fifths of the time, receive a $1700 stipend, and work seven extra days. The crucial distinction is that teacher leaders must hold administrative certification and evaluate teachers, while senior teachers do not.

With respect to teacher evaluation, we must address two questions about differentiated staffing. Do the results of teacher evaluation determine who will become a differentiated staff member? How do differentiated staff participate in teacher evaluation?

The answer to the first question is that the process of becoming a differentiated staff member is indirectly related to the teacher evaluation process. The first step to becoming a differentiated staff member requires that a teacher apply for a position. This position is announced through posting the job description. The job description, for example, of Senior Teacher--High School addresses the senior teacher's role in curriculum design and implementation, budget, improvement of instruction, classroom teaching, etc. A teacher who applies for this position would expect to be assessed in these categories.

A screening committee consisting of school-level administrators and teachers interviews candidates and records its observations on a form. The form asks for general information on such personal characteristics as self-expression, motivation, relevance of schooling and vitality, but not on performance in the classroom. However, the job description forms the basis for the interview, which is then recorded on the form.

An ineffective teacher whose evaluator has expressed concerns about the teacher's performance generally will not apply for a differentiated staff position, since it is highly likely the evaluator will be on the interviewing committee. Should an ineffective teacher apply, he or she would be screened out (the principal will know the teacher and the results of the teacher's evaluation).

Still, the selection process does not necessarily result in the selection of teachers who are the most effective classroom teachers. Some very effective classroom teachers do not apply for differentiated staff positions because they are unwilling to devote the time to tasks that the position demands (e.g., budget, reports).

The second question asks how the various differentiated staff participate in the teacher evaluation process. In the elementary and junior high schools, the role of teacher leader was adopted to provide assistance to the principal and to reduce the number of teachers to be evaluated by one evaluator. The school system apparently seeks a ratio of not more than 1 to 20; when a principal has many more than 20 teachers to evaluate, a teacher leader is assigned.

The role of senior teacher is understood by many to have been instituted as a master teacher concept (where the teacher recognized as superior serves as a model) but seems not to be working in the way originally intended. Senior teachers were to be senior colleagues--not responsible for evaluation--to whom a teacher could turn for advice. The idea was to create a nonthreatening situation in which the more competent could help the less competent.

The senior teacher role as it functions today has become more administrative; instead of spending the bulk of their time providing instructional support, senior teachers work on curriculum, statistical reports, and budget. In the high school, senior teachers in some

programs perform many of the functions of department chairpersons, especially in those programs lacking a division chairperson.

As noted, senior teachers do not evaluate other teachers. Yet, especially in some departments in the high school, they will be the most immediate administrative personnel who know the subject-matter of members of their departments. Senior teachers face a dilemma. On the one hand, they are not given access to the results of the teacher evaluation process. On the other hand, they are expected to provide instructional leadership and to ensure conformity to the curriculum. A delicate compromise has evolved whereby the evaluator may seek the advice of the senior teacher and the senior teacher may inform the evaluator of problems; yet the norms of collegiality often work against the exercise of this compromise.

HOW EVALUATION WORKS IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

Teachers As Laborers and/or Professionals

A school district's approach to teachers, generally, and to teacher evaluation, specifically, must rest upon a conception of teaching work. As a school system decides on its approach to teachers and teaching, it makes explicit or implicit judgments about how teaching operates or should operate. In an attempt to understand how these conceptions actually operate, researchers have structured theoretical conceptions which, while seldom found in pure form in the real world, nonetheless help to explain the real world.

Mitchell and Kerchner have described two basic approaches to task definition:

> Some jobs are structured primarily through "rationalization." That is, specific tasks are preplanned (by either managers or the workers themselves) and then undertaken as a matter of routine enactment of standard operating procedures. . . . In other job settings, however, tasks are primarily adaptive--requiring accommodation to unexpected or unpredictable elements within the work situation. In this case, the task definitions cannot be embodied in a preplanned program. Instead, the emphasis must be on responding to conditions arising on the job, exercising proper judgment regarding what is needed, and maintaining intellectual and technical flexibility.[2]

---

[2]Douglas E. Mitchell and Charles T. Kerchner, "Labor Relations and

They also describe two basic approaches to evaluating work performance:

> Some workers are subjected to direct oversight through close supervision . . . or through stringent reporting requirements. . . . For other workers . . . oversight is indirect. Preparation and skill--that is, the *ability* to perform the work--are the prime considerations. In the first case, the work itself is "inspected." In the second, the work often goes unexamined while workers are certified or "licensed" to perform work on their own.[3]

Mitchell and Kerchner use the term *labor* to describe "those work settings where tasks are rationally planned and oversight is undertaken by direct supervision."[4] They emphasize that labor is not distinguished by its association with low-level jobs but by its rationalized and preplanned character.[5] They use the term *professional* to describe workers who "are expected to analyze or diagnose situational factors and adapt their working strategies to the true needs (not just the expressed wishes) of their clients." Professionals are responsible for deciding whether particular tasks *should* be performed.[6]

Goal setting and staff development in Greenwich rest on a conception of teaching as a profession. The teacher is expected to possess a repertoire of specialized techniques and the ability and freedom to exercise judgment about their application.

The system-wide staff development program operates separately from the evaluation process and relies on the teacher's own discretion about what, if any, self-improvement he or she requires. The system goes to great length to keep teacher-evaluation and staff development separate. A teacher may, as part of the achievement plan for a goal, decide to avail himself or herself of a staff development offering. We encountered no instance of a staff member being required (although perhaps some were encouraged) to undergo staff development.

Teacher Policy," in Lee S. Shulman and Gary Sykes (eds.), *Handbook of Teaching and Policy* (New York: Longman, 1983), p. 215.

[3]Ibid., p. 216.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid., p. 217.

[6]Ibid., p. 218.

System-wide staff development provides a menu of activities for the individual development of the teacher. Perhaps because participation is voluntary, staff development tends not to be focused on system-wide or school-wide improvement (except insofar as individual improvement cumulates to collective improvement).

School-based staff development, which also occurs in Greenwich, appears to be not directly related to the results of teacher evaluation. That is, low teacher performance in an area is not seen as the motivation for specific school-based staff development. Rather, it is typically related to other forces like curricular change. In short, the separation of individual staff development and teacher evaluation reinforces a conception of teaching as profession wherein the individual chooses, as an official document states, "to experience continued improvement in job performance and personal and professional growth."

The Greenwich school system is placing more and more emphasis on system-wide goal-setting, detailed planning, and observable, if not measurable, outcomes. Movement in this direction tends, by implication, to treat teaching as labor.

Greenwich teachers are increasingly expected to implement a standard curriculum and they are evaluated on conformity to the curriculum. Indeed, in the high school, the evaluator draws on the expertise of senior teachers (nonadministrators) in judging how faithfully a teacher is implementing the curriculum. We encountered no evidence that teachers are being pressured to conform to any particular method of instruction (although individual principals may promote particular methods).

The outstanding--and professional--quality of the Greenwich teacher evaluation system is its contribution to the teacher's sense of efficacy. This contribution is made mostly by the goal-setting process, which is intended to improve the performance of the teacher.

To change behavior, a person must know or be shown what steps to take, and he or she must have or have developed a sense of empowerment or efficacy. When the goal-setting process works, it is primarily because it fosters efficaciousness. The person must perceive or be made to perceive that a given course of action is both valued and possible.

When he achieves his goal as a result of changing his behavior, he perceives that his performance has improved. If the organization in which the person works values the goal, then it also will consider his performance improved.

A substantial number of Greenwich teachers believe that the evaluation process helps them to improve their teaching performance. The committee that oversees the evaluation process surveys the staff periodically to assess how the system is working. In 1980, 360 (of over 600) teachers returned the committee's questionnaire.

In answer to the question "Do you feel that the evaluation process this year helped to improve your teaching performance?" 50 percent of the 204 teachers who responded to this question answered affirmatively. In 1981, 47 percent of 293 teachers responding said yes. (Teachers who did not complete the questionnaire or did not answer this question may view the process less positively.) Those who found the process helpful reported:

- "I am very conscious of improving in the area I chose."
- "Yes . . . it is a good discipline."
- "Provided positive reinforcement!"
- "Helps you to achieve your plans."
- "Helps you zero in on one or two areas to work on for that year."
- "It is important to have constructive feedback."
- "I was totally aware I had commitments to fulfill."
- "It kept my focus on specifics."
- "It does help one focus on the job ahead."
- "Yes. The process serves a definite purpose. It makes you think about your performance as the year progresses. If you think about what you are doing, you are bound to do a more competent job in the classroom."

Goal Setting

The teacher evaluation process, specifically goal setting, contributes to a teacher's sense of efficacy, primarily by regularizing interaction between the teacher and a member of the school's administration. Regular interaction between teacher and administration is not the norm in American public schools. The process provides an opportunity for the system to engage the individual teacher.

In this process, the evaluator is able to communicate system goals, impart teaching techniques, and perhaps foster the teacher's sense of efficacy. The process, especially the conferences associated with it, provide an opportunity to shape behavior. As the organization, through the evaluator, interacts with the teacher, it can and does affect the teacher's feelings of self-efficacy which, in turn, affect performance.

For a school system to change the behavior of a teacher, it must enlist the cooperation and motivation of the teacher. Greenwich seeks to do this through the goal-setting process. Formally, the system, as represented by the evaluator, and the teacher together develop goals. The process of mutual development is, in fact, a negotiating process that begins from two different premises. On the one hand, the system articulates its own goals, which it hopes and/or expects teachers to pursue. On the other hand, it expects the teacher to take the initiative in establishing his or her own goals.

To change a teacher's behavior, the system must persuade the teacher that its desired goals are correct and that the teacher can attain them. Since the goals have been adopted by the system, they are correct unless, of course, they violate the teacher's sense of correctness. Many teachers quickly pick up the cue and adopt the system's goals as their own. In so doing, they forestall an extensive negotiation process.

As noted, Greenwich is moving from decentralization to centralization and from a view of teachers as professionals toward a view of them as laborers. Evaluators still believe that they should accept the teacher's choice of goals out of deference to teacher professionalism. Yet the system holds them accountable for implementing system goals. Evaluators therefore are relieved when teachers voluntarily accept board goals.

Until recently, evaluators usually accepted nearly all goals proffered by teachers; some still do. Evaluators new to a school may acquiesce in their first year so as to build rapport. Nearly all feel compelled to accept the goals of teachers who are clearly outstanding.

What do evaluators do when they judge a teacher's proffered goal to be inadequate? What occurs in the negotiation session? The approach varies by evaluator, with some operating uniformly with all teachers and others differentially.

Evaluators may try to impose goals using either the authority of their office or an intellectual exchange. They may try to induce all teachers to adopt district or school goals; they may impose these differentially based on subject-matter differences or an assessment of the teacher as hopeless, remediable, or outstanding. They may try to get teachers to "stretch"--to shed their timidity.

Evaluators often push teachers to adopt measurable or observable goals, and some consider their major impact to be in this area. Often teachers will have selected a vague or unmeasurable goal. Some evaluators emphasize helping teachers to devise their achievement plans. Others reject safe goals or those that are easy to achieve.

Teachers, for their part, may acquiesce to whatever the evaluator suggests. Or they may resist. They may argue that goals should be measurable and observable so that criteria are clear-cut, thus limiting unsupportable inferences by the evaluator; that the administration does not have the right to impose goals--that only the teacher has the right to select goals; or that the teacher is required to have only one goal, that it need not be especially challenging, and that minimal compliance is all that is required.

We examine below a few cases of goal setting judged exemplary by the administration.

Ms. B, a fourth-grade teacher, and her evaluator have agreed on two goals: first, "to broaden her professional life by taking part in three staff development activities"; second, to reinforce basic writing and math skills for her students through the use of enrichment activities. Ms. B achieved the first goal by engaging in staff development activities. Thus, the achievement of certain goals is self-evident;

this strategy for compliance is often chosen. The goal, the achievement plan, and the mechanism for measuring goal attainment are integral.

The second goal is tied to classroom processes and appears intended to push Ms. B to engage in certain activities that she has not engaged in before. She provided multisensory motivation for writing and encouraged students to become enthusiastic letter writers. Ms. B was judged by her evaluator to have "fully accomplished" this. At the same time, Ms. B received substantial reinforcement for her effort. Her evaluator reported that the results were exceptional. Ms. B plans to continue to develop her approach.

The attainment of an instructional goal results in external recognition by a professional peer or evaluator of what has occurred in the classroom. In American education, this relatively rare occurrence may be an important motivational device.

Mr. F, a ninth-grade social studies teacher, chose, as his goal, to teach library research skills. According to his evaluator, his success, based on specifying teaching techniques, was impressive. Again we see that a teacher can gain recognition for his teaching techniques, techniques that might otherwise be invisible to his colleagues and superiors. Mr. F, it might be added, is not without his problems. His evaluator continues to work with him over his tendency to "obfuscate and complexify" assignments.

Mr. I teaches ninth-grade mathematics; his goals were to "integrate the computer into the junior high school math curriculum" and "to improve the rapport and professional relationships that I have with students in my classes and to eliminate negative reaction of parents to my actions in class." Mr. I's evaluator judged that he "fully accomplished" his first goal but that the second goal needed to be recycled (repeated) the following year.

Mr. I evidently has problems in his relations with students that he has not been able to overcome. The evaluator stated that he would recommend "marginal status" in the subsequent year if any "incidents" occurred. Thus, the goal-setting process can result in a teacher being placed under more severe scrutiny.

Linkage of Evaluation to Planning, Development, and Decisionmaking

The Greenwich teacher evaluation system produces a tension, however. Because it is based on personal goals, the system fails to provide a uniform measure of individuals. Lacking a common standard, the system cannot be used equitably, for example, to select teachers for performance-based reductions-in-force.

An evaluation system for ranking teachers for RIFs must be based on common standards, typically related to procedures and classroom management; evaluators may be generalists. In such a system, the reliability of the evaluations counts more than the quality of the advice given the teachers. In a system in which improvement is the goal, teachers require help from specialists rather than generalists, and the quality of the advice matters more than the reliability of the assessment. A system that helps teachers to improve must be flexible enough to afford continuous growth, whereas a system intended to rank teachers needs reliability much more than flexibility.

In operation, the teacher evaluation system is linked to the school system's overall goal-setting and priority-setting process. Although the teacher evaluation system was designed to begin with the teacher's assessment of his or her own needs, it is being influenced more and more by centrally determined goals. Teachers are encouraged to pay attention to system goals as enunciated by the board, superintendent, and principals. The linkage between teacher goals and system goals is tighter than the linkage between the teacher evaluation system and any other planning and/or operational system in Greenwich. The system succeeds in focusing everyone's attention on system goals.

The other linkage, which is tight only in some schools, is the use of the system by some evaluators for exercising their supervisory responsibilities. Some principals and other school-based evaluators use the framework of the teacher evaluation system to legitimize their entry into the classroom and their giving advice to teachers. While evaluators who are inclined to supervise teachers closely might use other bases (such as the authority of their office), they find the teacher evaluation structure convenient.

The teacher evaluation system is not linked to other school system planning and development and decision processes. In certain instances the absence of linkage is by design. Teacher evaluation and staff development are deliberately separated. In other cases, the absence of a linkage is unintended. Thus, the teacher evaluation system does not often culminate in personnel decisions, especially in the case of tenured staff.

This brings us to the ambivalent view which the administration (including some members of the central administration) have about the teacher evaluation system. Officially, the school system and most members of the administration believe in the teacher evaluation system and behave as though they consider it very important. They also believe that although the system was designed for individual improvement, it should provide information for a variety of decisions. They expend significant energies in implementing and improving it. They justify this expenditure on the basis of the utility of the information derived.

Yet, in some sense, many administration members also cannot bring themselves to take the system seriously. This view was revealed to us in such statements as: "You know the staff anyway"; "when you really want to find out about a teacher, you use other means"; "the system does not measure good teaching"; "teacher evaluation does not improve instruction"; and "everyone knows who is terrific . . . and who is not." In other words, judgments about people are made without reference to the teacher evaluation system.

Real decisionmaking does not rely on the teacher evaluation system. For example, a process entirely divorced from the teacher evaluation system is used to select new teacher leaders or senior teachers. While choosing people for leadership roles in general requires assessing their leadership ability, choosing people for instructional leadership roles might require assessing their instructional ability as well. The results of the individual teacher evaluations are apparently never collated and used for planning and decisionmaking. Staff development and curriculum are planned without systematic reference to the results of teacher evaluation.

Time for Evaluation

Administrators in Greenwich, as elsewhere, complain that they do not have enough time to evaluate teachers, that other administrative duties squeeze time for teacher evaluation. To lower evaluator/teacher ratio, Greenwich instituted the role of teacher leaders so that most evaluators would have no more than 20 teachers to evaluate. Now teacher leaders complain that other administrative duties limit the time that they have available for teacher evaluation--perhaps because other duties take precedence or perhaps because other duties are *given* precedence.

The minimum time demands of teacher evaluation--a goal-setting conference, a midyear conference, an observation, and an end-of-the-year conference--can be met in less than four hours a year. (One must recognize that evaluators may need to prepare for contacts with teachers; they must also write evaluation reports. We have assumed that these occur outside the school day.) Thus, an evaluator can have the minimum contact with 20 teachers in less than 80 hours. Since a school year contains approximately 900 hours, the required contact can be accomplished in less than 9 percent of an evaluator's time, or less than 30 minutes a day.

Our study was *not* a study of how administrators spend their time. Consequently, we cannot say that it should be hard or easy to accommodate teacher evaluations. Indeed, we cannot say whether 9 percent of an administrator's time spent on teacher evaluation is a lot or a little. All we can report is that evaluators in Greenwich find it difficult to fit it into their schedules, and we do not know whether they actually spend the minimum time.

Time spent on evaluation, of course, has a financial cost. Assuming at least the minimum allocation of time, our crude estimate here of 9 percent translates into a sizable cost as a fraction of administrators' salaries. Teacher evaluation, particularly if one adds the cost of teacher time, central administration time, and training session time, is costly, a subject to which we turn in the next section.

EVALUATING THE TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

In Greenwich, both teachers and administrators consider teacher evaluation important. They consider it important because the school system recognizes the fact that evaluation takes time if it is to be done well and provides the resources for it. Greenwich has set a guideline ratio of one evaluator to 20 teachers and has deployed teacher leaders (who spend about half their time on teaching and half on administration) to maintain this ratio in schools across the district. The released time of the teacher leaders translates into increased human resources for evaluation.

Both principals and teacher leaders are evaluated on how well they perform their evaluation functions. The elementary and secondary supervisors read and critique every single teacher evaluation report for its thoroughness and specificity. They also check to see how well the evaluations match up against the lists of "marginal" and "outstanding" teachers which the principals include in their annual school assessment reports.

Evidence of evaluation ability is a high-priority criterion in evaluators' own annual evaluations. Improving evaluation performance is likely to appear as a personal goal for a principal's annual review if it has received insufficient attention. Since teacher leaders are not supposed to have competing administrative responsibilities, their continued tenure in that position is tied to their performance as evaluators. Their efforts and those of principals are buttressed by a cadre of 66 senior teachers who receive released time to provide assistance and counsel to other teachers on matters of curriculum and teaching technique.

Figure 2 summarizes the four basic purposes that teacher evaluation may serve. Clearly Greenwich uses teacher evaluation for the two improvement purposes. Although the system was designed for individual staff development, it is used increasingly for school improvement, that is, the attainment of board-defined and program-team-defined goals and priorities. Half of the teachers responding to the district's survey find that the evaluation process helps them to improve their teaching performance.

Purpose / Level	Improvement	Accountability
Individual	Individual staff development	Individual personnel decisions (e.g., job status)
Organizational	School improvement	School status decisions (e.g., accreditation)

Fig. 2 — Basic purposes of teacher evaluation

Our interviews and the data available to us do not permit us to conclude definitely which improvement purpose is better served. Most teachers, however, seem to prefer to see the system focus on their personal development needs as perceived by them. Consistent with a professional ethos, most teachers with a preference would rather propose their own performance goals than have the system impose goals on them. In contrast, some teachers prefer to be given goals by their evaluators.

We have no way to determine whether teachers' self-perceptions of improved performance are related to actual performance or to effects on students. However, to the extent that teachers' goals, whether their own or the system's, are sanctioned by their evaluators, we can conclude that performance is moving in the direction desired by the system. What we cannot judge is whether the transition to system-imposed goals will increase or decrease the percentage of teachers who find that teacher evaluation helps them improve their performance.

The Greenwich teacher evaluation system is not designed to serve accountability purposes, and it is not used as a basis for school status decisions (e.g., accreditation). Administrators are making a strong effort, however, to tighten the process so that they can use it in making individual personnel or job status decisions. Although the tightening effort has been going on for several years, we saw little evidence of the evaluation system's successful use for personnel decisions.[7]

Many teachers and some administrators clearly recognize, however, that the use of the teacher evaluation system for personnel decisions works at cross-purposes to its use for improvement. When the system is used for making personnel decisions, teachers and some evaluators become cautious in their selection of meaningful goals, thus obviating the value which the system has.

The administration's efforts to use the system for personnel decisions may result in a teacher evaluation process that serves no purposes well. An adequate tightening of the teacher evaluation process so that it could be used for personnel decisions might well end its utility for performance improvement, unless performance improvement is achieved by eliminating the worst teachers.

Teacher evaluation systems have costs and benefits and some may wonder whether the Greenwich system, in which only half of the teachers report that it is helpful, is justified. After all, this means that half have not reported finding it helpful. We crudely calculated that evaluators (mostly principals) must spend about 9 percent of their time on teacher evaluation. This represents a sizable percentage of administrative resources. The cost is balanced by what is probably a larger-than-average fraction of teachers finding teacher evaluation helpful.[8]

---

[7]Subsequent to our study, the director of personnel reviewed the circumstances surrounding the resignation or dismissal of all teachers during the past 2-1/2 years. Of the 125 resignations and dismissals during this time, 31 resulted from the evaluation process. The contracts of 3 of the 31 staff members were terminated; the remaining staff were "counseled" out of their jobs as a result of the evaluation process. In the course of interviews with principals, teachers, and others, we heard no mention of this use of the evaluation process.

[8]In a small study of three nonrandomly selected districts (excluding Greenwich), we found that very low percentages of teachers in

We believe that the following four conditions are necessary for the successful operation of a teacher evaluation system:[9]

1. All actors in the system have a shared understanding of the criteria and processes for teacher evaluation.
2. All actors understand how these criteria and processes relate to the dominant symbols of the organization; i.e., the actors share the sense that these criteria and processes capture the most important aspects of teaching and that the evaluation system is consonant with educational goals and conceptions of teaching work.
3. Teachers perceive that the evaluation procedure enables and motivates them to improve their performance; principals perceive that the procedure enables them to provide instructional leadership.
4. All actors in the system perceive that the evaluation procedure allows them to strike a balance "between adaptation and adaptability, between stability to handle present demands and flexibility to handle unanticipated demands," that is, that the procedure achieves a balance between control and autonomy for the various actors in the system.

In Greenwich, all actors do share an understanding of the teacher evaluation *process*. However, we found growing ambiguity with reference to the purposes to which the results will be put. This ambiguity is beginning to strain the process.

As for the second condition, when Greenwich operated with a more professional conception of teaching work, the core assumption that the individual teacher was best able to set his or her own goals for improvement fit well. While that belief has not been explicitly

---

two districts reported that their teacher evaluation system had helped them improve their performance.

[9]See Linda Darling-Hammond, Arthur E. Wise, and Sara R. Pease, "Teacher Evaluation in the Organizational Context: A Review of the Literature," *Review of Educational Reseach*, Vol. 5, No. 3, Fall 1983, p. 320.

rejected, to it has been added a new management orientation and a different conception of teaching--the idea that the system should set the goals to be implemented by teachers. Under the new orientation, academic leadership comes from the top rather than from the operating level. Thus, different conceptions are operating simultaneously, with confusion to be expected.

Concerning the third condition, we conclude that some teachers believe that the procedure enables and motivates them and that some principals perceive that it enables them to provide instructional leadership.

With regard to the fourth condition, the Greenwich teacher evaluation can best be described as in flux. The issues of system control and teacher autonomy lie at the core of the shift now occurring in management style. Teacher evaluation and staff development have rested on a model of self-improvement based on teachers' personal goals. These goals are articulated in the evaluation process and pursued through both clinical supervision and individually selected staff development courses. In a sense, each teacher is evaluated against his or her own yardstick, appropriate to his or her stage of development and particular teaching challenges.

In recent years, the district's management-by-objectives strategy has begun to collide with the personal goal-setting strategy as centrally determined goals are accorded precedence. The district's plans to use teacher evaluation results as a factor in reduction-in-force decisions produce tensions for individualized goal-setting and assessment. Whether these strategic inconsistencies will prove fatal to the effectiveness of the teacher evaluation system remains to be seen.

IV. THE TOLEDO (OHIO) PUBLIC SCHOOL INTERN AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

Linda Darling-Hammond

REASONS FOR THE SELECTION OF TOLEDO

The Toledo public schools (TPS) teacher evaluation plan, launched in 1981, gives teachers and administrators joint responsibility for controlling entry into teaching. Toledo may be the first school system in the country to institute a truly collaborative approach to the supervision and evaluation of first-year teachers in which peer review plays a central role.

The TPS *Intern Program* places newly hired, inexperienced teachers under the supervision of expert consulting teachers for their initial teaching year. The consulting teachers are released from classroom duties to supervise no more than ten interns in their grade level or subject area. These consultants, chosen for their own exemplary teaching records, are responsible for supervising, assisting, and evaluating the interns in all areas relating to teaching competence.

The principal rates the first-year teacher only on noninstructional performance (e.g., attendance and compliance with district policies). In the second probationary year, the principal assumes the conventional supervisory role.

This unique approach to the evaluation of beginning teachers is supplemented by an *Intervention Program*, which uses the same cadre of consulting teachers to supervise experienced teachers who are having difficulty in the classroom. Candidates for Intervention Program assistance are recommended by the building committee--a group of teacher representatives--and the principal. Once placed in the program, the intervention teacher receives intensive supervision and assistance from an assigned consulting teacher, who assumes responsibility for evaluation as well.

The consulting teachers' recommendations regarding future employment of interns and intervention teachers are reported twice annually to the Intern Review Board, a nine-member panel composed of five teacher representatives appointed by the Toledo Federation of Teachers (TFT) and four administration representatives appointed by the superintendent. The review board votes to accept or reject the consulting teachers' individual recommendations and forwards these determinations to the superintendent for final action.

The intern and intervention programs affect only a small proportion of teachers in the school system (about 75 of 2500 over two years). Nevertheless, they represent important changes in the philosophy and practice of teacher evaluation in Toledo.

First, the programs are grounded in a shared governance approach that has begun to permeate many other features of the district's management and operations. After many years of often bitter adversarial relations between the teachers' union and management, the two sides initiated a conscious attempt at collaborative decisionmaking. The intern and intervention programs are both a result of this effort and a catalyst for ongoing cooperation in areas related to teacher policies.

Second, the new evaluation initiative reflects a decided step toward professionalism of teaching in the Toledo public schools. The central role of peer review by master teachers in the evaluation process is one element of a professional conception of teaching work. Another element is the assumption of professional competence underlying an evaluation system that rigorously screens entrants to teaching and is then reactivated only if serious problems become evident later in a teacher's career.

Although administrative supervision occurs in the interim (after the probationary period ends principals evaluate teachers once every four years until tenure is reached), the system places emphasis on preparing and screening new teachers so that the need for ongoing supervision is minimized. In addition, teacher professionalism is encouraged by the existence of other incentives for professional growth, such as a special salary increment for receiving a master's degree in an area of teaching expertise, rather than in an administrative or nonteaching area.

Third, the institution of the intern and intervention programs, by all accounts, considerably improved the practice of teacher evaluation in the Toledo public schools. Because the programs target significant resources of time and expertise on the two subsets of evaluatees most in need of assistance, they provide more intense supervision where it is most needed.

Freeing principals of the primary responsibility for evaluating new and marginal teachers accomplishes several things. It relieves them of a time-consuming obligation and allows them to direct their energies at more general, school-wide improvement efforts, including the less onerous task of regular (interim) teacher evaluation. It tempers the role conflict experienced by principals who must maintain school morale and cohesion while enforcing standards of accountability. And it encourages a closer match between the teaching skills of the evaluator and evaluatee than would be possible if principals were sole evaluators of all personnel in their buildings.

In sum, Toledo's innovative approach to teacher evaluation has created a new dynamic for improvement based on teacher-administrator collaboration in its public schools. Although now widely endorsed by nearly all actors in the system, these changes in the teacher evaluation process were bold reforms that occurred only after many years of union and management debate.

THE POLICY CONTEXT

The Toledo public schools serve 44,000 students, of whom one-third are eligible for Chapter I services for low-income children. The ethnically diverse student population (60 percent white, 33 percent black, and 7 percent hispanic) has been declining for several years. As a result, few new teachers have been hired, and the average length of service of the 2500-member teaching force is now over 13 years.

The heavily vocational programmatic emphasis of the public schools reflects the city's industrial context. At the secondary level, more teachers teach trade and industry subjects than any other single subject area except language arts. The combined vocational areas (business education, home economics, industrial arts, distributive education,

agriculture education, apprenticeship training, and trade and industry training) support nearly as many teachers as language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies together.

Like many other industrial cities in the Midwest, Toledo can be characterized as a union town. Its population of 350,000 is dispersed in ethnic, blue-collar neighborhoods with rather distinct identities. In 1977, production workers comprised two-thirds of the city's labor force.[1] The next largest segment of the labor force is government workers.

Public School Crisis and Reform

During the late 1970s, the Toledo public school system was devastated by a series of school closings due to a revenue shortfall, a failed bond levy, a teachers' strike, and snow. Many parents left the city or placed their children in private or parochial schools rather than face the uncertainties of a fiscally and politically unsettled public school system. In 1980, 54 teachers were laid off as a result of declining enrollments and dwindling finances.

Now, however, the public schools show signs of resurgence. In fall 1982, a large bond levy was passed by 70 percent of the voters, the largest margin of support in the school system's history. Many parents who had left the system are returning and staff confidence and morale are high.

The current school system is the phoenix that emerged from the ashes of the 1977-1978 debacle. Having struggled through a year in which schools were closed nearly as often as they were open and in which open hostilities among union, administration, and public officials ran high, all of those concerned with public education in Toledo saw that a concerted effort to agree on an agenda for the future was essential to the continued survival of the system.

In 1978, the board hired a well-respected superintendent from outside the system. Don Steele, the new superintendent, conducted a large-scale needs assessment and community goals survey before beginning to reconstruct the school system a piece at a time. His deputy and

---

[1]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *State and Metropolitan Area Data Book, 1982*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1982.

successor, Hugh Caumartin, has continued the task of slowly rebuilding curriculum and staff capabilities.

Each of these superintendents adopted an approach to the powerful Toledo Federation of Teachers that might best be termed constructive engagement, rather than maintaining the adversary posture of the past. Dal Lawrence, TFT president since 1967, responded in kind, and a number of new mechanisms for union/management cooperation were set in motion. Many of these, including the intern-intervention program negotiated as part of the 1981 contract, were initiated by the union.

According to both school personnel and community representatives, 1978 marked the beginning of a new era of reconciliation between the TFT and the school administration. This cooperation, most say, has contributed greatly to the noticeable overall improvement in the quality of the schools. Respondents of all kinds also share a generally positive view of both the administration and the union leadership. The union is always described as "extremely powerful," because of both the local union ethic and the strong, continuous leadership of the TFT president. However, while never underestimating this power, school administrators no longer universally regarded it as threatening.

The central administration's recent efforts to exert more influence over school operations are also widely acknowledged: A new student testing program and a curriculum standardization initiative have been instituted and the central office now controls budgeting and personnel policies more directly. However, most teachers (and principals) do not consider their autonomy unduly constrained by these actions, in part perhaps because they have not (yet) been rigorously enforced and in part because some centrally initiated reforms were recognized to be necessary. Perhaps most important, the governance structures that have been fashioned to implement the changes have sought a careful balance among representatives of teacher, administration, and public interests at the school and district levels.

This is not to say that Toledo has no unresolved governance issues. Many long-standing and emerging debates have important implications for the delicate balance of powers undergirding the new teacher evaluation process. Because both the evolution and effectiveness of that process stem from the new conception of cooperative governance, it is important

to understand the formal relationships between teachers and administrators in Toledo.

Union/Management Relations

The characterization of Toledo as a union town is also, in many ways, an apt description of the school district. Some administrators complain about the extent of TFT control over certain aspects of school operations, but most simply accept it as a fact of life in the school system.

One high-ranking central office administrator described the importance and respect generally accorded the TFT when he said: "We call union officials about some things that would surprise you. . . . We're fortunate in the caliber of union leadership we have here. Most of the improvements in this school district are the result of the union." Although this view predominates, it is not universal. Another central office administrator expressed the view that the union controls too many management prerogatives and that the union leadership "panders to the lowest common denominator" in the teaching force. Everyone agrees, however, that the TFT is a significant force to contend with.

Over the past decade, the TFT has gained important protections for Toledo teachers, in large part because of the longevity and determination of its leadership. The union staff fight hard for grievances, and the teaching staff widely support the union's unremitting membership protection activities.

When salary gains were precluded by fiscal problems, the TFT bargained for rights, strengthening the contract language (and its enforcement) with each negotiation. The TFT obtained substantial seniority rights for teachers, limitations on class size and noninstructional duties, and the right to appoint teachers to serve "on all committees relating to curriculum, testing and staff development."[2] Thanks to the contract, teachers in each school elect their own department chairpersons (as well as building representatives). The contract also provides that:

---

[2] *Agreement between the Toledo Board of Education and the Toledo Federation of Teachers, 1981-83*, Article XXVI, Section A(1).

> The superintendent of schools and his designated assistants shall meet at least once a month with not more than five (5) representatives of the Federation at the request of either party, to discuss matters of educational policy and development as well as matters relating to the implementation of these policies.[3]

At the top levels of the system, the administration can make few decisions without at least consulting union representatives. An effective administration in Toledo must be prepared to spend time either talking or fighting with the union about policy initiatives. Although the current administration has developed its own agenda for strengthening school district management, it has opted to talk with teacher representatives rather than provoke hostilities. A parent activist spoke approvingly of the administration's management style:

> The school system has become more centralized but through a democratic approach. Everyone has input into committees. The superintendent listens well and shares ideas. He follows the [collective bargaining] contract.

In Toledo, the contract is an important governance tool. It is a comprehensive document that specifies not only how teachers will be treated but also how decisions affecting teachers are to be made. It embodies two different conceptions of teaching work that exemplify the tensions existing in Toledo and elsewhere.

On the one hand, the contract offers strong protections for the teaching force as a whole in its labor versus management role. Seniority governs nearly all decisions regarding hiring, transfers, and reductions-in-force. The hiring process is particularly important. A school vacancy is filled by the most senior person with appropriate certification in the following order: (1) recall from layoff; (2) within-building applicant; (3) voluntary transfer request; (4) other within-district applicant; (5) priority hiring list of substitute teachers; (6) new teacher.

---

[3]Ibid., Article I, Section F(1).

Substitute teachers are evaluated by their building principals on the 3d, 15th, 30th, and 50th days of continuous service. After 60 days in one assignment, they gain regular contract status; after 90 days they are placed on the hiring list. They accrue system seniority from the first day of service in one assignment.

Unless no one in the seniority queue has the required certification for a vacant position, this system gives neither the personnel office nor building principals much opportunity to select new employees. Surprisingly, this is a sore point for only a few administrators.

The system also seems to treat teachers as members of a labor pool rather than as professionals. Other protections in the contract pose further questions of the compatibility between teacher (organization) power and teacher professionalism, if professionalism is viewed as a function of individual expertise rather than collective power.

On the other hand, the contract embodies a view of teaching as the exercise of both professional rights and responsibilities based upon expertise. The self-professed goal of the TFT president is to "use collective bargaining as a means for establishing a profession for classroom teachers."

The superintendent also endorses the intern and intervention programs as initiatives that "raise the status of the profession, use all the system's levels of professional resources, and make teachers part of the solution to problems of educational quality." He wants eventually to establish a more comprehensive, differentiated staffing system that explicitly recognizes good teachers and uses their skills both inside and outside the classroom.

While the TFT lays undisputed claim to the initiation of the intern program, having brought it to the bargaining table in each negotiation since 1973, both sides take credit for the intervention concept. The superintendent views the evaluation reform as a 50/50 compromise: the union wanted an intern program and management wanted an intervention program. The TFT president, acknowledging that the school board's negotiating team raised the intervention idea, called it a serendipitous opportunity to achieve one of his own goals for professionalizing teaching. Interestingly, the superintendent feels that the primary

purpose of evaluation should be to promote individual professional growth; the TFT president says the primary purpose is--and should be--accountability.

Regardless of who first endorsed which aspects of the intern-intervention program, the process of implementation demands collaboration. This is a bold change for Toledo, where management was once a check-countercheck activity. Cooperation has been achieved through a careful balance of powers at the top levels of district and union management. In this sense, the changes are an additional centralizing force in the decisionmaking structure of the system.

Centralization and Governance

The emerging conception of teaching work as a professional activity in Toledo strikes a delicate balance between individual teacher autonomy and collective teacher power, between decentralized and centralized exercise of professional rights and responsibilities.

Teacher involvement in educational decisions occurs largely through appointments of teacher representatives to centralized committees or panels. Mechanisms for teacher input into decisions at the school level are much weaker: Building committees composed of an elected building representative and several other teacher volunteers handle grievances, while elected department chairpersons are mainly responsible for acquiring materials and supplies and serving as a liaison between teachers and the central office or TFT.

Teachers' preferences for in-service activities are conveyed through elected representatives to the Staff Development Control Board. Building committee involvement in the intervention program is channeled through the TFT central office. The extent of real participation of building committees or department faculties in decisionmaking varies widely from school to school, depending largely on the leadership style and temperament of the principal.

Thus, at present, the role of teachers in educational decisionmaking in Toledo is mediated through the central offices of the TFT and the administration. Although many teachers (and some administrators) describe the system as moving from an autocratic to a democratic form of governance, the means for participation are designed

more to ensure a balance of powers between teachers and administrators than to foster autonomy of individual professionals.

The TFT president opposes decentralization for both principals and teachers. He believes that it is more fruitful for teachers to make decisions through teacher committees and that "the representational system reconciles professionalism with centralization." Certainly, a representational system allows the TFT greater control of decisionmaking. The implicit assumption seems to be that a united and powerful collective teacher voice is the most effective way to ensure teacher freedoms within the classroom and school.

The TFT--which now operates a closed shop--polls its membership on many issues and maintains close contact with building committee representatives in an attempt to ensure that its positions are widely supported by teachers. Yet the inevitable centralizing effect of this approach creates operational rules that in at least some instances constrain teachers as well as administrators.

Management action has also contributed to centralization. Before 1978, the Toledo public schools operated "like bank branches" in a highly decentralized system that included school-based budgeting and excluded central controls over most aspects of program or curriculum.

Since 1978, Superintendents Steele and then Caumartin have initiated steps to standardize grading procedures, textbooks, curriculum, and discipline practices and to centralize budgeting. Caumartin also introduced a testing program and reorganized the research division to allow better use of testing and program evaluation data for planning purposes. Caumartin describes himself as "data-oriented" and "product-oriented." He plans to assert greater central control over instructional programs and to introduce building-centered improvement strategies, such as a new "effective schools" initiative and increased in-service training for principals.

The newly appointed assistant superintendent for curriculum is developing new curriculum guides and competency standards for students. In her opinion, precise goals and rationally planned teaching procedures can reduce the probability of inadequate teaching, and she would like to see a closer link between curriculum and teacher evaluation.

In practice, the Toledo public schools appear to operate as an increasingly centralized but loosely coupled system. Formal decisionmaking takes place with representative participation at the top levels of the system, but many policies are not rigorously enforced system-wide. For this reason, and because teachers feel well protected by grievance mechanisms, they report that they have sufficient autonomy. Some principals feel constrained by recently centralized budgeting procedures and by seniority rules for filling vacancies, but others say that there is enough autonomy for those who "know how to work the system."

According to the view from outside (as conveyed by school board and PTA representatives), teachers have enough autonomy, but principals may indeed have too little. Although the board has pushed for more centralization and continues to try to control administrative personnel decisions, this activism, they say, is what "drove administrators into a union" a few years ago. Some current board members feel equally disempowered by the union and the administration. Recent union-management cooperation seems to them to have created a bipartite governance structure that leaves the board searching for loopholes through which to exercise its own authority.

The Politics of Evaluation

The growing cooperation between the TFT and the TPS administration provides an important framework for understanding the new teacher evaluation process. A key question in the adoption of the intern and intervention programs was whether a collaborative approach to teacher evaluation would tip the balance of powers between union and management. The centralized structure for collaboration also posed questions about the compatibility of centralized governance with a professional conception of teaching.

In accepting the intern program in the 1981 contract negotiations, the board, according to many administrators, bargained away management rights to evaluate beginning teaching personnel. One central office administrator who still holds this view stated: "I would not recommend this approach as a model for the nation. It gives away management

rights." Although he conceded that the new process is proving to be more effective than the earlier teacher evaluation process, he asserted that "management could do the job [of evaluation] if they made it a priority."

According to a more widespread point of view, principals were so constrained by time and negotiated contract limitations that their supervisory rights were only theoretical anyway. As one principal put it: "We didn't lose power. We never had it." A number of principals and central office administrators expressed the view that management was clearly not doing an adequate job at evaluating teachers because of principal and supervisor overburdens; therefore, allowing teachers to assume some of these responsibilities has at least practical merit.

For pragmatists, the question of shifting power relationships matters little. As one principal said: "Unfortunately or not, the teachers' union can be more effective than administrators at improving teacher performance. . . . Maybe we should all be in the same union, then there wouldn't be any conflict."

The superintendent's view is both pragmatic and philosophical. Principals did not have the time to devote to evaluation of first-year teachers and those experiencing serious difficulties, and they had trouble reconciling their evaluative and support functions. The changes relieved them of these burdens. In addition, the changes provided an opportunity to get away from the "simplistic adversary game" that has characterized union-management relations. As evidence that administrative control has not been surrendered, he--and several others--mentioned that the plan can be canceled at the end of any year by either side. For many, the system of checks and balances is key to the potential success of the plan.

Overall, although many administrators felt that the new programs may have strengthened the hand of the union in the area of teacher evaluation, they nevertheless considered the outcomes positive. One high-ranking central office official stated:

> I was initially opposed to this because it looked like a union power grab. But teachers are now perceiving some of the problems, and cooperation is emerging as a result of the [teacher evaluation] activities. . . . Teacher involvement in

> decisionmaking is not necessarily the same thing as a power grab. We're adapting to this change, and we're getting more evaluation of a more realistic kind.

Thus, while management may have given up absolute (theoretical) control over teacher supervision, it has gained more practical (although indirect) control over the quality of the teaching force than existed before. One teacher noticed this and voiced the fear that union-management collaboration might eventually result in less, rather than more, protection for teachers. She asked, "How can the union, having participated in this process, defend an intern whose contract is not renewed?" What she was in fact pointing out is the shift in emphasis from teacher protection to teacher participation as the union strives for a professional conception of teaching.

Participation as a strategy for empowerment is a double-edged sword. It accords rights to teachers while heightening their responsibility for the decisions that are made. The shift from an adversarial to a participatory approach accords power over a greater range of educational matters at the cost of absolute protections based on work rules. Mitchell and Kerchner talk about this evolution toward professionalism in terms of three "generations" of labor relations:

> [F]irst-generation labor relations are characterized by an acceptance of the proposition that ultimate authority in all school policy matters rests with the board. . . . First-generation labor relations end with the onset of a political struggle over the legitimacy of teachers' rights to organize and deal collectively with school systems. A second generation begins when the teacher organization is accepted as a legitimate interpreter of teacher interests. . . . Teacher interests are accepted as legitimate, but as inimical to those of management. During this period teacher "wins" are seen as management "losses." As the second-generation relationship matures, overt conflict generally subsides as each side develops ways of accommodating the essential interests of the other. In doing so, however, they tend to isolate school board and citizen groups from the process.
>
> A second district-wide controversy erupts when disagreements over the propriety of teacher organizations' power and influence over matters of personnel and policy become politicized. The third generation in labor relations--which arises only after there has been overt political rejection of

> the second-generation arrangement--involves teachers in the creation of "negotiated policy" for the school district. School boards and managers eventually come to recognize that working conditions for teachers are inextricably bound up with major educational policy decisions and that both are being hammered out at the bargaining table.[4]

Perhaps because the arrival of a third generation in labor relations occurs only after the teachers' organization has amassed sufficient power to be legitimated as a partner in policymaking, teacher professionalism in the modern context may not be inimical to unionism. Mitchell and Kerchner argue that, generally speaking, union strength leads to a conception of teaching work as labor rather than a profession, because

> [R]ationalization [preplanning and routinization of activities] is encouraged as teachers attempt to protect themselves. Closer inspection [monitoring of teacher work performance] is stimulated by management efforts to define and enforce their rights in responses to unionization.[5]

In Mitchell and Kerchner's view, collective bargaining encourages the centralization of operations and standardization of work routines that impede professionalism. The Toledo approach, however, moves beyond traditional collective bargaining toward a professional conception of teaching.[6]

First, the Toledo approach defines teaching work not only through negotiated work rules but also through assessments of individual expertise made by fellow practitioners. Second, it gives teachers the responsibility for determining who enters and continues in the profession through the teachers' organization. Third, the union defines its membership not only by employment but also by "competence," at least as determined by the internship for entry. Finally, the means for

---

[4]Douglas E. Mitchell and Charles T. Kerchner, "Labor Relations and Teacher Policy," in Lee S. Schulman and Gary Sykes (eds.), *Handbook of Teaching and Policy*, Longman, New York, 1983, p. 220.

[5]Ibid., p. 221.

[6]This discussion is based on ibid., pp. 228-230.

teachers' control of their work include not only constraints on management, but also the extension of teacher autonomy by (eventually) assuring enhanced social status based on recognized competence for members of the profession.

What is occurring in Toledo may be the evolution of a fourth generation in labor relations that goes beyond "negotiated policy" to "negotiated responsibility" as the basis for school district operations. Perhaps the adversarial, due-process-oriented consolidation of power by the union in the past decade provides the basis for a collective professionalism more potent than the individual professionalism that existed when unorganized teachers had only permissive authority over the substance of their work.

This move toward collective professionalism contains the seeds of collaborative control over teaching quality; it also threatens the foundations of both management's and the union's earlier claims to power. Thus, to succeed, this approach will require considerable attention to maintaining a balance of powers between the two parties. It will also require careful implementation that demonstrates the fairness and effectiveness of the process.

Mitchell and Kerchner observe that "at root, labor policy involves creating a balance of powers between labor, management, and the public interest."[7] The Toledo plan reshapes this configuration to one in which labor and management jointly define and implement a process intended to *serve* rather than counterpose the public interest.

The danger of the Toldeo approach is that, lacking a formal mechanism for public involvement, it may fail to serve the public interest. The advantage is that the approach allows for the possibility that educators--teachers and administrators--will work together to improve the quality of their common professional work. This can be achieved only if the process as implemented avoids eroding the power base of either side or diluting the process to a point where visible public benefits do not occur.

---

[7]Ibid., p. 228.

THE REGULAR TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS

Implementation

Beginning teachers in Toledo are subject to a two-year probationary period, after which they may receive a four-year contract if recommended by the principal. Prior to the initiation of the intern program, the principal (or other supervisor[8]) evaluated beginning teachers twice during each of the probationary years, recommending renewal or nonrenewal at the end of each year. Now the principal (or other supervisor) is responsible for supervision and evaluation of second-year probationary teachers only.

If performance at the end of the second probationary year (or at any other contract renewal point) is marginal, the principal may recommend a third one-year contract rather than a four-year contract. One-year contracts may also be granted to teachers who have limited provisional certificates pending completion of course work in a particular teaching area, e.g., special education. Once a teacher receives a four-year contract, he or she is evaluated only during the year in which the contract is to be renewed, i.e., every fourth year. A teacher who completes 45 months of successful teaching experience and obtains a master's (or equivalent) degree receives a permanent (life) certificate and may escape evaluation entirely.

Generally speaking, evaluation in Toledo is an infrequent activity after the probationary period is completed. Exceptions occur when a teacher returns to teaching from inactive status. He or she is then evaluated in the same manner as a beginning probationary teacher.

The evaluation form and procedures differ for beginning (first- and second-year) and experienced teachers. The process for evaluation of beginning teachers was derived from Redfern's supervision and goal-setting model. As described in the district's evaluation guidelines,[9] it includes, at minimum:

---

[8]Central office supervisors have primary responsibility for evaluation of teachers in certain specialist areas, such as special education, reading, speech and hearing therapy. In addition, supervisors play a key role in evaluating music teachers and physical education teachers.

[9]*Supervision, Evaluation, Goal-Setting: The Toledo Plan*, 1982, p. v.

1. A preliminary conference, in which the evaluator discusses supervision, evaluation, and goal setting with the teacher at the beginning of the school year.
2. A goal-setting observation during the first few months, in which the evaluator assesses the teacher's performance.
3. A goal-setting conference shortly after the observation, in which specific performance goals are established. (The roles of evaluator and teacher in goal setting are not specified.)
4. A growth period to allow the teacher time to follow through on the performance goals.
5. A summary evaluation and conference, in which the evaluator completes the summary evaluation form (see Fig. 3) using performance goals as a basis for the evaluation and subsequent conference.

First-year teachers are observed at least three times annually[10] and second-year teachers twice for at least 20 minutes each time. An additional observation is required if the spring-term evaluation results in a rating of "unsatisfactory." The criteria for evaluation include teaching procedures, classroom management, knowledge of subject, and personal/professional characteristics.

Teachers on four-year contracts are evaluated using the same criteria but in much less specific form (see Fig. 4). The contract outlines the procedures for evaluation:[11]

> One (1) classroom observation, prearranged between the teacher and the administrator for the purpose of making this evaluation, shall consist of at least twenty (20) minutes but not more than fifty-five (55) minutes. Other classroom visits shall not be used for this evaluation. If visitation is excessive, a limit on visitation may be imposed by mutual agreement of the Federation and the board. . . . This section

[10]Teachers in the intern program are observed more frequently; however, some first-year teachers are not interns because of their prior experience as substitute teachers in Toledo or other experience in another school district.

[11]*Agreement between the Toledo Board of Education and the Toledo Federation of Teachers*, Article XVIII, Section E.

TEACHER SUMMARY EVALUATION REPORT

Name _____ School _____ Date _____

Grade or Subject _____ Period of Sept.-Dec. ☐ Period of Jan.-March ☐

Amount of time spent in observation _____

Check on March and Dec. Report	Check on March Report Only	Contract Status
☐ Outstanding	☐ Recommended for second one-year contract	☐ First year contract
	☐ Recommended for initial four-year contract	☐ Second year contract
☐ Satisfactory	☐ Recommended for third one-year contract	☐ Four year contract
☐ Unsatisfactory	☐ Not recommended for reappointment	☐ One year contract
		☐ Continuing contract

	Outstanding	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
I. TEACHING PROCEDURES			
A. Skill in planning			
B. Assessment and evaluation skills			
C. Resourceful use of instructional material			
D. Skill in using motivating techniques			
E. Skill in questioning techniques			
F. Skill in making assignments			
G. Ability to recognize and provide for individual differences			
H. Skill in developing good work-study habits			
I. Voice quality			
II. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT			
A. Effective classroom facilitation and control			
B. Effective interaction with pupils			
C. Efficient classroom routine			
III. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT			
IV. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY			
A. Shows a genuine interest in teaching			
B. Appropriate interaction with pupils			
C. Is reasonable, fair and impartial in dealing with students			
D. Personal appearance			
E. Skill in adapting to change			
F. Adheres to accepted policies and procedures of the Toledo Public Schools			
G. Accepts responsibility both inside and outside the classroom			
H. Has a cooperative approach toward parents and school personnel			
I. Is punctual			

Evaluator's Signature Teacher's Signature Principal's Signature

Evaluator's Position

Date of Conference _____

(See opposite side of page for directions)

Fig. 3 – Evaluation form for first-year teacher

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TOLEDO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL
Manhattan and Elm Streets, Toledo, Ohio 43608 (419)729-5111

FOUR YEAR CONTRACT EVALUATION FORM

All teachers serving in their fourth year of a four year limited contract will be evaluated. A copy of the completed evaluation form must be on file in the Office of Personnel, room 102 on or before March 15, 1983. The following teacher is employed under a limited contract which expires June, 1983

NAME _____ SCHOOL _____

GRADE/SUBJECT _____ DATE _____

I. TEACHING TECHNIQUES
Includes planning and organizing; skill in presenting subject; ability to motivate; recognition of individual differences; and ability to develop good work habits and attitudes, etc.

High ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ Low

II. CLASSROOM CONTROL
Includes rapport with pupils; respect for rules; atmosphere for learning; and efficient routines, etc.

High ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ Low

III. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT

High ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ Low

IV. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS
Includes responsibility, dependability, interest, enthusiasm, effective speech, personal appearance, health and emotional stability.

High ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ Low

(IF NECESSARY, USE REVERSE SIDE FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS)

RECOMMENDED FOR A FOUR YEAR CONTRACT YES _____ NO _____

_____ (Teacher's signature

_____ (Principal's signature

Copy to: Executive Director
School Office
Teacher
Office of Personnel

48
Rev. 2/81

Fig. 4 – Evaluation form for teachers with four-year contract

is not intended to prohibit interviews for the record when rules and policies are violated as per Article XXXIV.

The principal also must frequently evaluate substitute teachers, who fall under the terms of the contract after 60 days and are placed on the priority hiring list after 90 days. Because substitutes accrue seniority in the hiring queue, their evaluation is important. The criteria for evaluating substitutes are quite vague, however, consisting of a single dimension ranging from "superior" to "unsatisfactory" (see Fig. 5).

Teachers' Views of Evaluation

The teachers whom we interviewed had had varying amounts of contact with the regular evaluation process. Depending on their contract status, some had not been evaluated at all for many years; others had been recently evaluated by a principal or special supervisor. We drew the following conclusions from interviews with these teachers.

The process of evaluation varies dramatically from one evaluator to the next and even, with the same evaluator, from one teacher to the next. Generally, those on one-year contracts received more intensive supervision (e.g., two 40-minute observations) than those on four-year contracts (e.g., no formal observation at all in some cases). Few discussed substantive matters of any kind with the evaluator; most merely signed the form, often on the day it was due in the central office.

Some teachers found the evaluation process somewhat helpful as a means for improving their performance; to most it made no difference. A number of teachers reported instances of what they considered unfair evaluations--evaluations in which good teachers received lower ratings than they should have or poor teachers who should have received unsatisfactory ratings but did not.

In general, the teachers felt that evaluation would be improved by:

SAMPLE OF EVALUATION FORM

6

EVALUATION REPORT FOR:

___ SUBSTITUTE TEACHER (fewer than 60 days)

___ CONTINUOUS BUILDING SUBSTITUTE TEACHER

Name of Substitute Teacher _____ School _____ Date _____

Grade and/or subject taught _____

Evaluation is based on _____ days of substitute work.

( ) 1. The SUPERIOR teacher: This is a teacher who exercises constructive influence and maintains cooperative professional relationships with parents, pupils and administrators. Willingly accepts responsibilities of a substitute teacher and is always striving for improvement.

( ) 2. The ABOVE AVERAGE teacher: This is a strong and capable teacher. Does excellent work in the classroom, is responsible and reliable. Cooperates fully with school policies and administrative requests. Maintains harmonious relationships with pupils and co-workers.

( ) 3. The AVERAGE teacher: This is an acceptable teacher. This teacher is reliable, responsible and shows promise. Tries to cooperate with administrators and co-workers as fully as possible.

( ) 4. The BELOW AVERAGE teacher: This is a weak teacher. This teacher has difficulty in adjusting to normal school situations. Continued effort and proper attitude may lead to improved performance.

( ) 5. The UNSATISFACTORY teacher: This is a teacher whose work in our building indicates little or no aptitude for the teaching profession.

Would you recommend this person for hire as a regular teacher? Yes _____ No _____

Remarks: _____

DEFINITIONS:

A daily substitute is one called daily to buildings.

Short term substitute is one in the same position in a building fewer than 59 days.

Continuous building substitute is a daily substitute stationed permanently in a school.

Long term substitute is one in the same position in a building more than 59 days. After the 60th day the regular teacher evaluation report is used. (Article XVIII - C-4 of TFT Master Agreement)

(See directions for use of evaluation instrument on reverse side.)

_____ _____ _____

(signature of substitute teacher) (signature of principal) (date)

Copy to: Personnel Office
School Office
Teacher

8-1
4/2/80

Fig. 5 — Evaluation form for substitute teachers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- More frequent observation
- Evaluation by peers in the subject-matter area or grade level of the evaluatee
- Emphasis on teaching competence and subject matter knowledge rather than classroom management
- A supportive approach offering guidance in a "continual process of consultation and problem-solving."

Teachers with both positive and negative views of their prior evaluation experiences made these observations with remarkable consistency. Most teachers did not fault principals for the flaws that they observed in the evaluation process, although some judged central office supervisors more harshly because of their isolation from the school environment. Instead, they directed their comments at the design of the process.

These teachers wanted for themselves a clinical approach in which a colleague would apply his or her own time and subject-matter expertise to their classroom problems. Even some highly experienced teachers would willingly agree, they said, to annual evaluation if the process were geared to improving teaching. But, in general, they felt that administrators lack the time, as well as the subject and grade-level expertise, to improve instruction.

Most teachers, having already endorsed the notion of more frequent observation, nonetheless defended as a necessary protection against harassment the contract provision limiting classroom observations for evaluations. This seeming ambivalence may reflect different views of an accountability-oriented versus an improvement-oriented process, or different perspectives on administrator versus peer evaluation. It may also reflect an as yet incomplete shift from a traditional union perspective emphasizing protection to a new perspective emphasizing professional responsibility.

Or, the inconsistency may simply indicate the tensions underlying any evaluation process that simultaneously tries to foster improvement and render personnel decisions. In Toledo, evaluation is conducted primarily for the purpose of making contract decisions. Supervision can

also assume an accountability veneer because consultations between principals and teachers must be conducted as "interviews for the record" with due process trappings if they are to become part of the personnel records system.

Perhaps for this reason, the TPS system assists teachers through mechanisms totally separate from the teacher evaluation process. The School Consultation Program and the Employee Assistance Program (described below) provide confidential assistance on request to teachers with instructional or personal problems. The staff development program offers teachers personal and professional enrichment courses on a voluntary basis. Teachers who use these programs often find them helpful, but they are relatively small-scale efforts that do not reach all teachers.

Evaluators' Views of Evalution

Administrators agree that they lack time for teacher evaluation. Some also feel constrained by the union from adequately performing their supervisory responsibilities. One central office administrator who believes that principals should have the primary responsibility for evaluation blames inadequate evaluation practice on the failure of the central office to give priority to evaluation by principals. "We haven't really tried to reduce their noninstructional burdens to give them sufficient time for evaluation. We haven't given principals enough training in evaluation or good, solid in-service on curriculum matters."

Administrators are not specifically evaluated on how well they supervise teachers. The administrator evaluation process is basically a self-evaluation based on goals set largely by the evaluatee and his or her own assessment of whether they have been met at the end of the year. Principals' goals generally focus on school-wide programs and/or school-community relations rather than teacher evaluation.

The amount of time a principal spends on evaluation varies with his or her style and the composition of the school teaching force. Some principals report spending as much as 20 percent of their time on teacher evaluation, including the time spent on informal observation and counseling; others spend less than 5 percent.

The proportion of an evaluator's time spent on evaluation is not, however, a good measure of the intensity of the process. The number of teachers to be evaluated in a given year varies widely from school to school. Schools that teachers consider desirable tend to have a stable teaching force of teachers on continuing contract who are rarely evaluated. Schools with a more transient staff have new teachers, substitute teachers, and recent transfers who must be evaluated more frequently.

Principals and central office supervisors who have a large number of evaluatees (e.g., as many as 20 in a single year) lack the time for real supervision. As one observed, administrators have difficulty protecting their time from the day-to-day demands of management. Evaluation receives lower priority than many such demands.

In the TFT president's view, procedural grievances arise because principals do not spend enough time on evaluation. Perhaps because the threat of grievances is real, in-service training for evaluators emphasizes procedures, such as the scheduling and documentation of observations and evaluation reports. Standardization of teacher evaluation practices, to the extent that it exists, results largely from due process and grievance procedures. Even so, many administrators feel uncertain about what they can and cannot do as evaluators.

One central office supervisor fears that if he drops in on or consults with a teacher "too often," the teacher will file a grievance. Another was reprimanded by the union for calling an in-service meeting of intern teachers. A principal who had required teachers to hand in lesson plans as part of the evaluation process stopped doing so when the union told teachers not to comply. "I didn't fight it," she said, "because then the next contract would have prohibited it." Another principal observed that "the union procedures force you to be mean." Having to formalize assistance or counseling, in his view, creates disincentives to supportive supervision. In general, evaluators see the four-year-contract evaluation, especially, as a mere "exercise" because teachers have so many protections.

We do not know whether these examples represent real constraints or excuses for less-than-rigorous evaluation. Some principals complain about the contract limitation on observations for evaluation, but they also report spending much less than the maximum allowable time observing most teachers. Other principals and many teachers point out that informal observation and consultation (short of harassment) are not limited. Thus, the real problem, if one exists, is the intensive supervision of teachers who need special assistance, especially those on continuing contracts. As one principal stated: "I don't want to decide a man's career on the basis of one 50-minute observation."

For most principals, situations requiring intensive supervision, particularly, create problems. One who had tried unsuccessfully to counsel a teacher having difficulties recommended nonrenewal as a means for triggering assistance through one of the other voluntary programs.[12] He expected the union to oppose termination on the grounds of an incomplete formal record. (Consultations must be documented if they are to form part of the record; informal conversations are not considered in personnel decisions.) "The problem for administrators in getting rid of poor teachers is the time it takes," he said. I could document anyone if I spent all of my time at it."

As a consequence of both time limitations and perceived procedural constraints, poor teachers are rarely improved or dismissed through the regular teacher evaluation process. Instead, they move around the system carrying their problems with them. As one principal described it, "If I put pressure on a teacher to shape up, the transfer process has a tendency to move that teacher from a performance pressure situation to an easier situation."

Evaluators consider the regular evaluation process slightly more useful than do teachers. They can, they say, successfully supervise and assist the average teacher whose needs are modest and who can profit from occasional advice about classroom management and instruction.

---

[12] The school consultation program and the employee assistance program provide confidential, voluntary assistance to teachers experiencing professional or personal problems. They are described in a later section of this case study.

Principals and teachers emphasize different evaluation criteria. Classroom control and compliance with district rules and policies (including curriculum policies) figure more prominently in principals' discussions of teaching competence than do knowledge of subject matter and technical proficiency. Nonetheless, most principals feel that their supervisory efforts could be enhanced by a joint administrator-peer review approach that draws on the expertise of teachers in relevant areas.

For teachers needing more sustained supervision, principals agreed with teachers that something more than the regular teacher evaluation process was needed. Their experiences with the intern and intervention programs have led them to endorse the outcomes if not the concept of an intense peer review approach to teacher evaluation. Furthermore, they see the potential benefits of adapting some elements of this new approach to the general evaluation system.

The Intern and Intervention Programs as Part of the Evaluation Process

The intern program provides for outstanding experienced teachers to supervise and assist beginning teachers. The intervention program offers the same kind of help to experienced teachers having difficulty in the classroom. Several features of these programs distinguish them from the regular teacher evaluation process.

First, the consulting teachers who provide this assistance are released from their classroom duties for up to three years to assist no more than ten interns (or intervention teachers) per year. They devote substantial time to each case, usually observing each teacher at least once every two weeks and consulting even more often on matters of planning, teaching techniques, identification of teaching materials, assessment of students, and classroom management. They give even more time to intervention cases because the process is more complicated. The programs, which command a budget of $80,000 per year, fund the substitute teachers needed to provide released time for consulting teachers, a $1250 salary increment to each consulting teacher, and teaching assistance materials.

Second, the programs match as closely as possible the grade level or subject area of the consulting teacher and that of the intern or intervention teacher. Although teaching specialties cannot always be matched perfectly, the program attempts to assign consultants from appropriate specialties. When this is not achieved, consultants are encouraged to call on subject-area supervisors or department chairs to assess the intern's competence in the subject area.

Third, evaluation and employment status recommendations are made by the consulting teachers to a nine-member Intern Review Board, composed of five teacher representatives and four administration representatives; the review board must vote by a two-thirds majority to accept or reject each recommendation. The review board assigns consulting teachers, designs in-service programs for consultants and interns, and manages the budget and all other aspects of both the intern and intervention programs.

The review board sends its recommendations to the superintendent, who then recommends termination or contract renewal to the school board. In the two years of the program's operation, only one consulting teacher's recommendation has been overturned by the review board. In that case, the superintendent rejected the recommendation to renew a marginal probationary teacher's contract on the ground that the teacher had not improved between the midyear and spring-term evaluations. Neither the superintendent nor the school board has rejected a review board recommendation.

Clearly, the success of the program rests on the abilities of the consulting teachers. The Intern Review Board selects these teachers after careful screening. The selection qualifications include a minimum of five years of successful teaching and five references--from the teacher's building principal and building representative and from three other teachers in the school--attesting to the applicant's abilities in the following areas:

- Teaching excellence
- School leadership

- Self-confidence
- Classroom management
- Ability to handle emergencies
- Creativity in teaching specific lessons to a variety of students
- Ability to generate ideas and solutions
- Human relations skills
- Communications skills.

The reference form ends with the question: "In your opinion, would this person be able to recommend termination of a beginning teacher's contract?" Obviously, a consulting teacher needs a blend of compassion and tough-mindedness.

In the first year (1981), the Intern Review Board selected 15 of the 75 applicants to form the consulting teacher pool. After three years' service as consulting teachers, they will return to their regular classroom responsibilities. (Incidentally, paid staff members of the TFT are not eligible for consulting teacher positions.)

A three-day in-service program was conducted for the consulting teachers prior to the start of the first year of program implementation. The in-service was designed to familiarize consultants with the program, their role and that of the review board, and the evaluation process. Discussions also centered on relationships between consultants and school personnel, how to handle potential problems and conflicts, support services available to interns or intervention teachers, observation and consultation techniques, and curriculum and in-service matters.

Toledo school system personnel widely accept and approve the intern and intervention programs, and for good reasons. First, the consulting teachers are of high caliber and dedicated. Second, the programs provide a carefully managed system of checks and balances embodied in the review board and operated by the assistant superintendent for personnel and the TFT president. Third, the implementation of the process receives high-level attention.

The Intern Program in Action

The intern program included 19 beginning teachers during its first year and 47 in its second. Most of the interns had specialties, such as special education, physical education, and vocational education, the demand for which exceeded the supply on the priority hiring list. Interns usually have little or no prior teaching experience beyond student teaching. Previous substitutes may be interns, depending on the length and nature of substitute teaching experience (i.e., whether the experience was in the same area as the new teaching assignment).

Because of the relatively small number of interns, not all of the consulting teachers have yet been called into service. In 1982-1983, four of the pool served as consultants full-time and several others worked part-time with interns in their specialty areas.

The consulting teachers have found their work exciting and challenging, and an opportunity for both professional and personal growth. As the program has evolved, their experiences and observations have spurred modifications that will strengthen the process in subsequent years. As mentioned earlier, both the union and management must agree to the program's continuation at the end of each school year. This need for annual recommitment also encourages continual improvement of the process; without a problem-solving process that satisfies both sides, one or the other would refuse to recommit.

Virtually everyone that we interviewed liked the internship approach. Interns found the intensive supervision and assistance helpful. They felt that the consulting teachers offered constructive, supportive teaching advice, helped them to overcome problems, and built up their self-confidence. Those who had consultants in their teaching areas found the specific curriculum and materials advice especially helpful. Those who did not nevertheless profited from the experience, but felt that it could have been even better had their consultant had experience in the particular demands of teaching their particular subject. Some of them who had received supplemental assistance from a subject-area specialist found the combination of resources useful.

According to other teachers, the intern program provided a positive contrast to their own "sink or swim" experiences as beginning teachers. They urged extensions of the program to permanent substitutes, second-year teachers, teachers who change teaching assignment, and even, some suggested, to all teachers. The strengths that they identified parallel the weaknesses that they perceived in the regular evaluation process: The internship is a supportive, continual process of problem solving; peer involvement creates a fairer, less threatening situation; and consultants devote more time to the process.

In addition, they considered the program valuable because it screens out those who will not be good teachers. Many remarked that the internship would upgrade the status of the profession and eventually reduce the need for an intervention program. "Maybe the internship is the beginning of teacher competency," said one. Another teacher, who had been a coworker of an intern whose contract was not renewed, felt personally sympathetic but agreed that the intern would not have made a good teacher. "I realized I would not have wanted my child in her class," she said.

Of the 19 interns in 1981-1982, two were not recommended for contract renewal; in the following year, two of 47 were not renewed. Although teachers and administrators believed the screening decisions to be fair and accurate, some pointed out that the interns lacked recourse to due process after the decision was made. On the one hand, because the decisionmaking process is collaborative, the teacher may be less well protected. On the other hand, this same collaboration makes the process more effective. Prior to the intern program, even probationary teachers were almost never dismissed. In the previous five years, the school district had successfully terminated only two teachers holding one-year probationary contracts, one in 1977 and one in 1978.

Principals' support for the intern program stemmed largely from a view that "it gives beginning teachers every chance to succeed" by providing much more assistance than they could ever offer. Many wanted to extend the program to all new teachers, as well as long-term substitutes. While approving of its operation and effects, principals were divided on the conceptual issue of teacher control over evaluation. One supported the concept as follows:

> Having a joint partnership for evaluation removes a roadblock to action and ultimately benefits kids. Control of entry is a sign of a profession that teaching has never had before. Secondary principals don't always have the subject matter content background for evaluation. Consulting teachers provide the time, the subject matter expertise, and good documentation necessary for sound evaluation to occur.

Another principal voiced the following reservation about the intern program:

> I welcome the help. I could never give that much time to a beginning teacher. But I mind the loss of power over first-year evaluation and, to some extent, curriculum. Principals are legally responsible for their buildings. Parents have raised questions about who is in control.

The question of authority over the first-year teacher is a sensitive one. In some instances, we heard, the union had complained when central office supervisors and principals sought to supervise, assist, or reprimand interns. The Intern Review Board concurred with the view that administrators must essentially relinquish control over the intern until the second probationary year.

Most principals are willing to follow this guidance, but they insist that they need more communication with the consulting teachers concerning the intern's progress during the first year to enable them to adequately evaluate the intern in the second year. Consulting teachers and review board members agree, and they are developing guidelines for principal-consultant consultation for next year. The goal is to preserve the independence of the consulting teacher from the school administration and protect the integrity of the peer review process while satisfying the principal's legitimate need for information about the quality of teachers in the school.

Some principals also called for a joint evaluation of second-year teachers. In their view, the positive outcomes of the process clearly justified power sharing.

Central office supervisors who evaluate teachers in areas like special education, music, and physical education were the most divided in their views of the intern program. Because they are curriculum specialists, their concerns focused on how well consulting teachers understood and enforced their curriculum concepts for the subject area.

For some supervisors, especially in areas with many new teachers, the intern program seemed to pose an obstacle to establishing a uniform instructional approach within the teaching corps. While some supported the program and felt the consulting teachers were receptive to their views, others complained that consultants, although certified in the subject area, did not share their approaches to curriculum and classroom management.

The supervisors' frustrations seemed to stem from their difficulty in communicating with teachers from whom they were separated by both their administrator and central office status. Teachers also expressed frustration with some central office supervisors, feeling that they did not understand the school and classroom environments within which teachers must operate.

The functioning of the Intern Review Board has contributed importantly to the success of the intern program. Throughout the period of changing roles and responsibilities, it has served as a sounding board for administrators' and teachers' concerns about the process. Jointly headed by William Lehrer, assistant superintendent for personnel, and Dal Lawrence, the TFT president, the board has diffused anxieties by responding to legitimate problems while protecting the integrity of the program.

The Intern Review Board meets four to six times a year to discuss emerging problems and to adjust program guidelines as necessary to ensure the program's smooth implementation. Between meetings, Lawrence and Lehrer keep an open channel of communication between union and management, heading off many potential problems.

This cooperation has ensured the survival and general acceptance of an idea that would be considered a radical reform in most school districts around the country. Given the former antagonisms in the Toledo public school system, this is no mean feat. The skill of

administration and union leadership in managing these changes has contributed even more to the success of the intervention program.

The Intervention Program in Action

In the two years of its operation, the intervention program has dealt with ten teachers (five each year). A teacher is placed in intervention only if the building committee and principal both agree that it is necessary. Although a unanimous vote of the building committee is not required, it is strongly encouraged. To our knowledge, no teacher has yet been placed in intervention without a unanimous vote (excluding abstentions). In some cases the principal initiates the decision; in others, the building committee first identifies the teacher.

A TFT notice to building representatives about the intervention program includes this description of an intervention candidate:

> Intervention is not for everyone. A teacher who is having *severe* problems with students as a result of poor classroom management techniques or poor teaching skills would be obvious candidates for intervention, however. *Marginally* poor (or acceptable) teachers probably can receive help from other sources. In intervention, a consulting teacher trained for the intern program *is assigned* to assist the teacher with severe problems. There is *no choice* left to the person having trouble. A *status report* is issued by the consulting teacher at the end of intervention. A decision regarding *future employment*, while it will not always be made, *can* be made by the personnel office.
>
> Obviously, a teacher on a *third* one year contract . . . would be [a] prime candidate for intervention, because they must be terminated or given a four year contract at the end of the third year of probation. If they are having trouble, any help we can give them should be welcomed. A teacher exhibiting bizarre behavior probably has personal problems and is experiencing a great deal of stress. A consulting teacher is not a psychiatrist. Intervention probably wouldn't work, but you should be in a position to determine that.
>
> In short, representatives must use common sense about who needs intervention and who does not. There are no objective yardsticks for such decisions. You will know when there is a general recognition at your school that a teacher's performance is severely deficient. If you, or just one or two others, seem to know about the problems a teacher is having but most faculty don't, be careful--just how severe is the problem really? [Emphasis in the original.]

Because placement in the intervention program may ultimately lead to dismissal, the placement process is extremely important. A building representative must call the TFT office before discussing any intervention candidate with the principal. A principal must contact the personnel office before talking to the building committee. Each must receive authorization to proceed before the nomination process begins. Committee members are urged to discuss the situation and to vote privately before contacting the principal for a joint decision on intervention. The personnel office notifies a teacher that he or she has been assigned to intervention.

The intervention process carries no time limit. The consulting teacher assigned to the case works with the intervention teacher in much the same manner as in the internship program, except far more intensively. The Intern Review Board hears reports on the progress of intervention teachers and decides whether to continue or stop intervention, depending on the progress that has been made, and whether to renew or terminate a contract.

We attended a board meeting at which the consulting teachers had spent 25 or more classroom observation hours with each intervention teacher since the previous meeting. Many more hours were spent discussing problems and strategies with the teachers and assisting them with instructional materials, planning, and other tasks. All observations and discussions were carefully documented, and the consulting teachers were prepared to answer many difficult, probing questions from the board members about the nature of the problems and assistance given to the intervention teachers.

During the past two years, one intervention teacher eventually resigned from teaching, one was dismissed, and two received nonteaching positions in the school system. Two teachers improved sufficiently to be removed from intervention and given continuing contracts; four continue to receive intervention assistance while on one-year contracts. In addition to removing poor teachers from the classroom, the intervention program provided assistance for teachers both in and out of the program by triggering increased attention to the problems of teachers experiencing personal or professional difficulties.

Administrators and teachers have reacted positively to the intervention program. Although some building representatives initially feared the concept, those we spoke to were reassured by the quality of assistance offered and the safeguards used in the process. Teachers observed that intervention "helps address problems that have been going on for years" and "is the fairest way to get rid of incompetence." Another teacher said: "The concept is good. Too many poor teachers get by. When the union was in an adversary role, it was too hard to get rid of bad teachers. Now the board and the union work together to get help for the teacher."

Those with direct knowledge of an intervention case often expressed personal sympathy and concern for their coworker but felt that the problems had grown so serious that they could no longer be ignored. In most cases, intervention teachers had 10 to 20 years of teaching experience and had been having difficulties for many years before being assigned to intervention. Personal problems, such as divorce and drug abuse, often contributed to teaching difficulties.

Some intervention cases were attributed to burnout, others to a combination of teaching incompetence and a negative attitude toward students. Typically, the problem had resulted in numerous complaints from parents about student treatment and had caused disruption to other teachers in the school as discipline problems spilled out of the classroom or student transfers created heavier teaching loads for others.

Administrators should have addressed these problems much sooner, many teachers said, but were "afraid to stick their necks out." At the same time, teachers recognized the administrators' reluctance to assume that responsibility. Some observed that building committee members hesitate to vote for intervention even when a problem is widely recognized, and suggested either that management should have more power to initiate intervention or perhaps a less-than-unanimous building committee vote should be allowed. However, they greatly valued the checks and balances in the process and would not want to weaken them for the sake of expedience.[13]

---

[13] The checks and balances in the intervention program selection process are important to ensure that rash or arbitrary decisions are not

Most teachers could identify others in their building who, they felt, could profit from intervention assistance. As one commented: "This is a good start. In 20 years we shouldn't have any incompetent teachers; but at this point we all know of cases where a teacher is poor and nothing is being done." In one school, the building committee was prepared to recommend two more candidates for the following year, having seen the program operate well this year. The elected building representative acknowledged the political risks involved, but felt strongly enough about teacher improvement to assume those risks. The extent to which a school--or the school system as a whole--can participate in the intervention program is clearly limited. To survive political pressures, the program must effectively reach some number of teachers, but not so many that its existence threatens most teachers or administrators (for whom frequent intervention could mean an admission of supervisory inabilities or the destruction of school morale).

Many observers commented that if an intervention teacher had been assigned to the program some years earlier, he or she could probably have benefited more from the help. However, the same observers usually answered no to the question of whether the intervention process would have identified that teacher when his or her problems were less severe.

Administrators strongly support the intervention program, and, like teachers, many would like to see it used more often. They agree that "for the first time, Toledo has been able to help or remove poor teachers." Their observations treat both the accountability and the

---

made. They are also important for maintaining the balance of powers and responsibilities between union and management, so that the legitimacy of the intervention assignment is firmly established. As an example, one teacher assigned to the intervention program at the close of the 1983 spring term has refused to accept assistance from a consultant and has threatened to sue the union for participating in the decision process. Because the assignment process was carefully followed and required a decision by consensus, the union's position, should a suit be brought, is much stronger than it would have been under a less rigorous process. Should the teacher refuse to accept help from a consulting teacher when school resumes in fall 1983, the personnel office will hold a hearing for the record, a preliminary step to dismissal, with far better evidence of failure to cooperate than if a less systematic process had been followed.

assistance goals of the program: "It's impressive. It actually works. We used to spend enormous effort to get rid of a bad teacher." "It's a much-needed program. It was almost impossible before to get a cooperative improvement strategy going for an older teacher."

Administrators suggested ways to start the intervention process more easily: more communication between the principal and building committee to get the process started; voting by an external teachers' committee rather than the building committee to offset coworkers' reluctance; and faster response from the personnel and TFT offices when a recommendation is made.

Administrators' eagerness to use the intervention process is understandable. Once an administrator succeeds in initiating intervention, the difficult task of supervising and evaluating the intervention teacher is passed along to a consulting teacher. The responsibility for recommending dismissal if improvement does not occur becomes that of the personnel office following a status report to the Intern Review Board.

While this desire to lessen the obstacles to intervention might be construed as "passing the buck" for difficult teacher evaluation, it also reflects a sincere desire for educational improvement. Although some principals have indeed ignored real problems, others who have tried to fulfill their supervisory duties have felt stymied by union grievances on the one hand and the voluntary nature of teacher assistance programs on the other. They simply had no real tool to apply to the problem.

Having seen intervention work, principals want to exploit its potential. The existence of the program has encouraged some to use the interim evaluation process more seriously rather than to regard it as a paper exercise. Using intervention as a last resort, they have been able to convince teachers to seek more voluntary assistance.

The success of the intervention approach has led some principals to conclude that a similar program should be established for administrators who are having difficulty. Perhaps because they do not want to be "outprofessionalized" by teachers, certain principals think that they should assume responsibility for policing their own profession. The superintendent, assistant superintendent for personnel, TFT president,

and others have suggested an intervention program for administrators, and the superintendent is seeking ways to strengthen administrator training and evaluation. Whether or not such an administrator intervention program eventually occurs, clearly the intern and intervention programs have triggered increased attention to evaluation throughout the system.

SYSTEMS SUPPORTING THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Because the intern and intervention programs affect a small portion of TPS teachers, and because other teachers are evaluated infrequently, we mention the other improvement-oriented mechanisms that exist alongside evaluation in Toledo. These include the *School Consultation Program* (SCP), negotiated by the union in 1978, and the *Employee Assistance Program* (EAP), cooperatively designed and introduced by management and the union in 1983. Each provides resources for voluntary assistance to teachers requesting professional or personal support.

The school consultation program consists of two teacher consultants released full-time from their teaching duties to provide instructional assistance to teachers in preschool through grade 8. About 40 to 50 teachers take advantage of this assistance each year. The program is funded by the district and coordinated by a joint committee of board and federation appointees. The district planned to expand the program through the 12th grade in 1983-1984.

The SCP may also serve teachers referred by other school personnel (e.g., principals), but only if the teacher agrees. SCP consultants have no evaluation responsibility, and all consultations are strictly confidential. One result of the intervention program is that an increased number of "preintervention" teachers are being referred to the school consultation program. Knowing that principals may initiate intervention, teachers seek and accept help on a voluntary basis more readily than was sometimes the case in the past.

The employee assistance program provides the services of a full-time counselor to any employee who needs help with personal problems. The counselor offers confidential counseling and referral assistance to school personnel who need support in handling family crises, drug or alcohol dependency, or severe depression, or who just need a sympathetic ear.

The EAP serves as an important alternative and complement to the intervention program. In some intervention cases, EAP assistance has supplemented the work of the consulting teacher. In other cases, the EAP is considered a more appropriate first step for a teacher having problems. Either way, the employee must participate voluntarily.

Together these programs provide a support network for teachers and an alternative to intervention as the answer to every teacher's problem. The programs also support the voluntary professional improvement approach of the staff development program.

The staff development program consists of teacher-selected professional growth seminars and district-initiated in-service training sessions. The $20,000 budget for staff development activities (apart from district in-service) funds one-session courses ranging from "Composition for the Junior High School Student" to "Floral Arrangements for the Home." About half of the courses are oriented toward improving teaching. Teachers may also take courses at nearby universities. They receive an $18 salary increment per credit hour completed in professional development courses. In-service sessions, generally conducted by curriculum directors, deal with procedures, teaching techniques, and new textbooks. These two components of staff development prove helpful to some teachers as a source of new ideas, but many complain that the offerings are not relevant to their needs or sustained enough to serve as a major source of renewal or assistance.

In 1982, the TFT staff development representative in each school conducted a teacher survey "to determine the specific needs and interests of teachers for in-service education." The results will be used in planning in-service activities more directly relevant to the needs of teachers. Although staff development is not at all linked to teacher evaluation, its evolving teacher-directed activity parallels the increasingly peer-oriented approach to evaluation. The programs are moving in tandem toward the professional control of teaching.

EVALUATING THE TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS

The stated goal of Toledo's teacher evaluation system is to establish "a cooperative and continuing process for the purpose of improving the quality of instruction." The intern and intervention programs have largely succeeded in making the evaluation of beginning teachers and experienced teachers needing special assistance a "cooperative and continuing process." The judgment as to whether the process "improves the quality of instruction" rests on assessments of its validity and reliability. The worth of the process for the Toledo public schools depends on assessments of its utility.

Validity of the Process

The validity of the intern and intervention approach depends on the consulting teachers. In a professional conception of teaching work, valid evaluation depends on the ability of a peer evaluator to understand, interpret, and assess the standard of practice exhibited by the teacher being evaluated. The consulting teacher must be able to judge the appropriateness of content and methods used by another teacher. To the extent that, first, consensus about content and methods exists in a teaching area and, second, the evaluator knows and can recognize these standards in action, the process is valid.

Teachers, administrators, and parents tend to believe that "they know a good (or bad) teacher when they see one." Indeed, one often finds remarkable agreement in a school or school district about who the good and poor teachers are. This consensus tends to be based on observations about classroom management: A good teacher runs a well-organized classroom which features concrete evidence of teaching and learning and rapport between teacher and students. Sometimes organization can substitute for teaching effectiveness, or rapport can substitute for good organization in such judgments. However, all agree that a poor teacher's classroom features none of these elements.

While classroom management may be an important component of good teaching and outstanding consulting teachers may be excellent judges of its presence or absence, a valid, professional evaluation process requires more than the assessment of classroom management. It requires

that the evaluator be able to judge the *appropriateness* of teaching decisions. It presupposes that teachers have sufficient knowledge of subject matter and child development to make appropriate decisions for different students and classes. Finally, it assumes that independent observers who have this knowledge can agree about when an appropriate or inappropriate teaching decision has been made.

The intern and intervention programs go a long way toward meeting this criterion of validity. Consulting teachers are chosen because their peers recognize them as experts in their teaching areas. Good judgment--a necessarily subjective but extremely important characteristic of a good teacher--is a major criterion for selection. The consultants are, indeed, expert judges of teachers in their teaching areas.

As one intern remarked of her consulting teacher: "She has 33 years of experience teaching kindergarten, and she really *knows* what a kindergarten teacher should be doing in all subject areas and how it should be done." Furthermore, the Intern Review Board forces the consulting teachers to make clear the standards of practice implicit in their judgments by requiring documentation of teaching events, suggestions made, and concrete reasons for "outstanding" or "unsatisfactory" ratings.

However, consulting teachers are not always assigned to evaluate teachers in their own teaching areas. Assigning consultants outside their areas of expertise weakens the validity of the evaluation process and dilutes the quality of assistance that can be offered. Many teachers and supervisors observed that while this is not a fatal flaw in the system, it decreases its potential value.

The absence of consensus on what constitutes the proper standard of practice in a given teaching area also threatens the validity of teacher evaluation. This problem is not unique to Toledo's system; it plagues education generally, and it is the major obstacle to professionalism. We observed one instance in which a subject-matter supervisor disagreed with the curriculum and classroom management conceptions of the consulting teacher in the same teaching area. In this case, the teaching area is a fairly new specialty that may not have yet evolved a widely accepted standard of practice. But competing conceptions of

teaching methods exist in all areas of education: Indirect instruction vies with direct instruction, open classrooms with closed classrooms, individualized methods with group instruction methods, and so on.

This problem of agreement on standards of teaching may be resolved in three ways (short of the indefensible stance that one best method of instruction exists). One may argue that different methods are appropriate in different circumstances and apply a standard of appropriateness to the choice of methods, given knowledge of the circumstances. Or, one may argue that, given a teacher's preferred approach, an appropriate standard of execution may be applied. Finally, one may take the middle ground and, within bounds that define and exclude absolutely inapproriate choices of method, accept the teacher's choice of method and assess its appropriate implementation.

The Toledo approach implicitly accepts this third means for resolving disputes about what constitutes proper practice. As in medical practice, a range of treatments is allowable (although some are contraindicated), and a standard of due care is applied to the choice and conduct of treatment. The Intern Review Board has enforced this conception by ensuring that recommendations for nonrenewal are not based on a conflict of teaching philosophies between the consulting and evaluated teachers.

In sum, the validity of the evaluation process in Toledo rests on a professional conception of teaching that requires (1) highly expert consulting teachers, (2) appropriate assignment of consultants to teachers being evaluated, and (3) a professionally acceptable means for resolving disputes about appropriate standards of practice. At present, the evaluation process has at least partially satisfied each of these requirements, and plans for improving future assignments should increase that validity.

Reliability of the Process

Reliability in evaluation measures consistency across evaluators and across observations. Some processes strive to enhance reliability by the use of a detailed observation instrument that carefully specifies behaviors to be observed and guidelines for rating those behaviors. Others strive to enhance reliability by training evaluators to place the

same values on observed events. Neither approach particularly suits a conception of teaching that places importance on the appropriateness of teaching judgments made in varying circumstances, since the characteristics of any teaching judgment cannot be fully anticipated in advance, nor can the full range of actual teaching judgments be covered in any observation instrument or training session.

In Toledo, reliability is largely a function of the reporting process. The small number of consulting teachers who serve as evaluators reduces the range of possible variability. More important, the consulting teachers convene with the Intern Review Board at one time to discuss their observations and evaluations. Even consultants who have no current assignments must attend the meetings. These discussions make explicit and concrete the criteria used in rating. The board probes for evidence of how the ratings were arrived at. The discussions develop a common framework among consulting teachers for rating the quality of teaching as "outstanding," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory."

The deployment of a small group of evaluators throughout the school system further increases the reliability of evaluation. Although school context may be a factor in judging the appropriateness of teaching methods used with a particular group of students, the acceptance of a lower standard of teaching in one school than in another is less likely in this more centralized system than one in which the evaluator's frame of reference is only a single school.

Finally, the frequency of classroom observation enhances the reliability of the process. The common complaint that a single observation is not a fair measure of teaching ability is avoided when evaluation is based on observations made at least twice a month over the course of an entire school year. The equally intensive consultation process, which incorporates joint goal-setting and problem-solving, also increases the probability of a common understanding between the evaluator and the teacher being evaluated about what is being observed and evaluated.

Utility of the Process

The utility of an evaluation process is partly a function of how well and how fairly it measures what it seeks to assess, i.e., its validity and reliability. Utility is also a function of how well the process achieves the desired outcomes of evaluation without generating excessive logistic, financial, and political costs that would impede the intended use of evaluation results.

For example, utility can be undermined if a process is too cumbersome to provide timely results or if its logistic demands exceed staff capabilities so that the process is not well implemented. Utility also suffers if the financial costs of a process exceed its perceived benefits. Sooner or later, the time and money resources committed to the process will diminish to accommodate other system demands and the process will be diluted. The process must be cost-effective enough to allow for a sustained level of effort.

Finally, political dissension can undermine the utility of a process by preventing decisionmakers from using the results. A process can be theoretically valid and reliable, but unless powerful political actors endorse it, the use of results will engender struggles that divert organizational energies away from system goals. In short, many evaluation systems that are theoretically and technically sound fail because they do not take into account logistic, financial, and political realities that ultimately determine its usefulness.

The measure of the intern and intervention programs' utility is that, by all accounts, it succeeds in helping teachers to achieve a level of acceptable teaching competency, or it removes them from the classroom if they do not reach this level. It does both of these things without disrupting the system's operations or destroying the morale of school personel. Three critical features of the process ensure its utility:

1. It is a carefully managed process conducted by evaluators who have no competing responsibilities

2. It is a tightly focused effort that uses limited resources to reach a carefully defined subset of teachers
3 It is a collaborative effort that engages the key political actors in the design, implementation, and ongoing redesign of the process.

First, by giving released time to consulting teachers and limiting the number of interns each evaluates, the process dramatically heightens the intensity of supervision and its usefulness for both individual interns and decisionmakers. The process absolutely precludes the all-too-common type of evaluation that is characterized by last-minute observation or no observation at all, poor documentation, and missed deadlines.

The results of a carefully conducted, serious evaluation process can be used to make fair and timely personnel decisions. The results of a process that places excessive logistic demands on evaluators are generally not useful because the evaluators' inability to fulfill procedural requirements leaves them vulnerable to charges of unfairness. A process that is too complicated or too time-consuming to be faithfully implemented has low utility in a world where teacher organizations can block dismissal attempts on procedural grounds. More important, the inevitable dilution of such a process reduces its usefulness for improvement purposes as well.

Second, by focusing the intern and intervention programs on two specific subsets of teachers needing special assistance, the process is cost-effective in a particular sense. While the costs of supervising each intern or intervention teacher are high (averaging about $2000 per supervised teacher in the first two years), the overall cost of the process is relatively low, and the substantive and political benefits are substantial.

The process ensures that only competent teachers enter the profession and that incompetent teachers are removed if they show no improvement. For the general public, these are the most important goals of teacher evaluation. Indeed, a process that achieves these two complementary objectives has high utility for both the school system and the teaching profession.

Targeting resources on teachers who most need supervision is a cost-effective means of facilitating the organization's work. An inordinate level of professional resources can be diverted from instruction by the institutional confusion surrounding inchoate efforts to handle the problems caused by a small number of incompetent teachers. Coworkers must continually deal with the results of the problem rather than its source, and overall school climate suffers when there is no help available.

A system that, in contrast, sought to closely supervise all teachers would waste valuable resources on the many who did not require that assistance; these resources also could more profitably be used for actual instruction rather than the monitoring of instruction. For accountability purposes at least, the intern and intervention programs have high utility; they achieve their goals without diverting resources from other aspects of the organization's mission.

Finally, because the programs are a joint venture of union and management, the political climate for implementation is more positive than would otherwise be the case. A forum exists for handling administrators' and teachers' concerns, and procedural mechanisms ensure fair and careful supervision. As a consequence, the results of the process and the process itself are useful, since they are not subject to continual grievances. If a decision is made to terminate a teacher's contract, the union does not initiate proceedings against the district, although it will represent a teacher who requests legal assistance.

The small size of the intervention program also contributes to its political acceptability. While some might argue that a program involving so few teachers cannot greatly affect organizational improvement, a program of broader scope might threaten organizational stability and morale. Toledo has balanced accountability and improvement needs by providing other voluntary vehicles for assistance that are not linked to personnel decisions.

In sum, the intern and intervention approaches have high utility because they effectively target resources on a small but important aspect of teacher supervision. They do so with the full cooperation of the union and management leadership and with the increasing acceptance and approval of school personnel.

Other Benefits of the Process

Although teacher evaluation is often uncoupled from other aspects of an organization's work, a seriously implemented process nevertheless has broad influence. The Toledo approach has had at least three important spillover effects.

First, teacher evaluation has changed the character of union and management relations in Toledo. School personnel at all levels of the system perceive that the earlier adversarial posture has given way to a "democratic approach to decisionmaking." The intern and intervention program forum for union-management cooperation has opened up other opportunities for dialogue away from the bargaining table.

Having identified common goals and concerns in the area of teacher evaluation, administrators and teachers have begun to find other areas where they can work together. Representational committees facilitate this process, but it even filters down to the school level where--in at least some cases--principals have begun to include building committees in decisionmaking.

This is not to say that areas of disagreement between organized teachers and administrators no longer exist. However, the approach to resolving disagreements is changing. Rather than focusing solely on constraining administrators' ability to exercise authority through procedural requirements, organized teachers have taken steps to participate in the decisions that affect teachers *before* they result in grievances. This enhances teachers' rights, but it also adds to their responsibilities. It forces administrators to share power but gives them more freedom to implement decisions once they are jointly made. Some teachers and administrators see this new approach as "progress into professionalism."

Second, the teacher evaluation process creates and reinforces a professional conception of teaching. This professionalization stems from the changing character of union-management relations, as well as the perception that teachers can improve the quality of teaching and police their own ranks. Because of its collaborative nature, the program's continued effectiveness may also contribute to a professional conception of the overall educational system. If the public perceives

that educators can manage their own affairs, public confidence in the educational system will increase.

Finally, the intern and intervention programs have focused more attention on personnel evaluation throughout the system. Principals are encouraged to devote more energy to their remaining supervisory duties, and the system is beginning to supervise principals more closely. With one small but potent accountability mechanism in place, incremental steps toward improvement garner more support. The intern and intervention programs belie the futility of evaluation. By demonstrating that evaluation can make a difference in both improving teaching quality and arriving at fair personnel decisions, the process encourages renewed efforts to improve the system.